FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 246 23 December 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Moscow TV Carries Discussion on SDI Issues AA 1
Israelyan Hopeful of CW Agreement in 1987 AA 20
[Dmitriyev]
Shishlin Reviews Events, Happenings in 1986 AA 21
Delegation Head Kashlev Speaks at CSCE Meeting AA 22

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Kobysh, Levin]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Peace Groups Send Letter to Reagan A 1
Rumors of Further Nuclear Test 'Provocative' A 1
Pentagon To Exploit Space Station for SDI A 2
Pentagon Said Pursuing CBW Research in Lahore A 3
U.S. Navy To Build Facility on Aleutian Island A 4
Briefs: Sabin Elected to Academy A 4

CHINA

Student Demonstrations in Shanghai, Hefei Noted B 1
Call for 'Democracy' B 1
No Punishment for Students B 1
Clash With Police Reported B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Voss Interviewed on Japan Roundtable Conference C 1
[IZVESTIYA 18 Dec]
Trade, Economic Conference Held in Japan C 3
Deputy Premier Kamentsev Meets DPRK Official C 3
[IZVESTIYA 19 Dec]

SOUTH ASIA

Moscow News Conference Held on DRA Situation D 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Dec]
More on News Conference D 1
Air Defense Chief Koldunov Completes India Visit D 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]
More on Dobrynin Talk With Bangladesh CP Leader D 3
[PRAVDA 21 Dec]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Sokolov Greets SRV Minister on Army Anniversary E 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Dec]
Vanuatu Approves Draft Fishing Agreement E 1
Laos Cooperation Commission Meeting Ends E 2
Philippines President Signs Mass Media Decree E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Hungarian Premier Lazar Begins 'Working Visit' F 1
Greeted by Ryzhkov, Antonov F 1
Presents Award to Sokolov F 1
Ryzhkov, Lazar Open Talks F 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL AFFAIRS

Further Coverage of Solomentsev Visit to Alma-Ata R 1
Addresses Komsomol Meeting R 1
Holds Talks With Kolbin R 1
Official Cited on Extent of Alma-Ata Riots R 2
[Paris LE MONDE 21-22 Dec]
TRUD Notes Criticisms at Kazakh Economic Aktiv [20 Dec] R 3
Dolgikh, Shcherbina Attend Power Workers Meeting R 3
Yeltsin Interviewed at Moscow Komsomol Meeting R 4
Sakharov, Bonner Return to Moscow 23 Dec [AFP] R 7
Sakharov Discusses Return [AFP] R 7
Supreme Soviet Delegation Returns From U.S. R 9
'Admiral Nakhimov' Inquiry Shows Safety Breaches R 9
Bravery Awards for Rescuers R 10
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Dec]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Farms Concerned About Frost Damage to Winter Crops T 1
[Pavlov in IZVESTIYA 18 Dec]
CSA Report on Meat, Dairy Production Cited T 1
RSFSR CSA Issues Agricultural Production Data T 2

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TASS Reports 'Mir' Orbital Station Parameters U 1
Cosmonaut Describes Joint Syrian Spaceflight U 1
Details of News Conference U 2
Plans for 2d Joint Bulgarian Space Venture Noted U 4

MOSCOW TV CARRIES DISCUSSION ON SDI ISSUES

LD230052 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Dec 86

["Repercussions" program on the theme "The U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative: Its Objectives and Consequences; the Plans and Reality; Who Is For It and Who Is Against It?" introduced by political observer Georgiy Zubkov with the participation of USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh; Academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy; Major General Yuriy Viktorovich Lebedev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Treaty and Legal Directorate; Andronik Melkonovich Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy; and political observer Boris Aleksandrovich Kalyagin -- live, except for recorded video introduction]

[Excerpts] [Begin recording; video shows series of unidentified people interviewed on the street]

[Woman] I am very worried by the problem of SDI and by Mr Reagan's behavior.

[Man] Are the people in the United States being sensible? What does the Reagan administration hope for? After all, 10 percent of these warheads will reach their territory anyway. What are they hoping for?

[Man] I have thought a little about this U.S. defense initiative which, of course, is a foul act against mankind. Doesn't it seem to you that the next President after Reagan will make a start and -- even if only for publicity considerations -- simply return to the existing level of approximate parity?

[Man] How long can this go on?

[Man] After all, they do not have any intention of launching an attack, so they say. So, where does the answer lie?

[Man] There is yet another question with regard to the plans for cooperation in space. Is there still some sort of hope that Soyuz and Apollo, even if under different names, at some future time will fly into space, after a period of time has elapsed, in maybe 5 or 10 years? Well, that is what I'd like to find out.

[Man] I know a bit about the SDI program and what specifically it represents. People all around us have no idea what it is.

[Woman] If there is peaceful cooperation is space then there will never be a war. I have a verse of my own and I will recite it:

I believe that the Earth's destiny is to grow wiser within the universe,
Our home -- our own planet -- will not perish;
Its savior will be matchless combination
Of mighty reason and the power of light.

I have our sun in mind. [end recording]

[Zubkov] Good evening, comrades. Our broadcast today is devoted to various aspects of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of the United States. It is a most topical and a most important subject. The SDI program has turned out to be the central point of solving such vitally important international problems as nuclear disarmament, the strengthening of security, and the lessening of international tension.

And even conversation that took place with passers-by in the streets of Moscow is a kind of viewers' introduction to our broadcast. It shows both your interest in the subject that has been chosen and a multitude of questions which arise in connection with the SDI program.

The participants in our broadcast today will help answer them. Let me introduce them to you:

Deputy USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, who has been engaged in diplomatic work since 1957; he worked in Washington and was head of the U.S. Department at the USSR Foreign Ministry;

Academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy, Lenin Prize winner, known through his works in chemical and nuclear physics, is deputy chairman of the Board of the All-Union Knowledge Society and takes an active part in the International Pugwash Movement of Scientists for peace and disarmament;

Major-General Yuriy Viktorovich Lebedev, deputy chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, graduated from the Dzherzhinskiy Military Artillery Academy, served in the troops and was a participant in the Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks;

Andranik Melkonovich Petrosyants, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic Energy, mechanical engineer by education, worked in production and occupied leading posts in the engineering industry, and for many years has been in charge of research in the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. He is academician of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences;

My colleague Boris Aleksandrovich Kalyagin, political observer of Central Television, was, as you remember, our television correspondent in Delhi and London.

Our talk today is the first live broadcast with replies to viewers' questions on international affairs, so its success does not only depend on the broadcast's participants, but also on your activeness, comrades, on your responses which we shall receive here via the telephone numbers that are shown in our Central Television studio. Some questions have already been received. They are contained in the letters addressed to Central Television and we shall use them, too.

Proceeding from the name of the broadcast that has been announced, let us examine three chapters of the SDI program: its objectives and consequences, the plans and reality, who is for it and who is against it. I repeat: We are waiting for your questions concerning these problems. And, for the time being, let us recall that the SDI program is linked to President Reagan's initiative on strategic defense. It was announced in one of Reagan's speeches, in March 1983 almost 3 years ago. What is SDI, the program of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative? Let us examine its military, scientific, and political aspects. Obviously, all the participants in our broadcast will have their say. Well, evidently you, Yuriy Viktorovich, will have the floor.

[Lebedev] All right. Before I say what SDI is, I would like to state unequivocally that it is a program for making arms which was announced by President Reagan on 23 March 1983. The world finds this program literally disturbing, and this has already been the case for a few years. What do they intend to do? What do they intend to create by keeping this program? It envisages the creation of large-scale ABM system, an antiballistic missile defense system with space-based elements. And, apart from that, in the context of creating arms for this kind of system, it is planned to develop offensive space weapons capable of striking targets equally in space, in the air, on earth, or on the surface of water. What will comprise the ABM system?

Well, antimissile missiles -- the antimissile missiles for long-range interception of ballistic targets and the antimissile missiles for close-range interception, that is to say interception already within the atmosphere -- are, as is known, the classic, traditional way of combating ballistic missiles worked out back in the sixties.

Well now, those who are developing [razrabatyvat] the SDI wish to deploy weapons, offensive weapons, in space. This makes it possible in practice to strike targets on the territory of any state in very brief periods of time. It is proposed to deploy in space the target detection devices, guidance devices, and target destruction devices. Moreover, these devices are being developed [razrabatyvat] on the basis of new physical principles. These include kinetic weapons, that is to say these can be ballistic missiles, guided missiles, directional beam weapons, such as laser weapons and, finally, electromagnetic emission weapons.

And so you have hanging over our planet weapons that are intended to intercept a ballistic missile along the whole of its flightpath and destroy it. The destruction of such missiles is supposed to happen both in the initial, or active, phase of the flight of such a missile, in the phase of separation of the warheads from this missile, the so-called ballistic phase of a missile's flight, and finally, in the descent phase of the missile, where existing and most highly developed weapons, so to speak, have been used and evidently will be used -- these are the short-range and long-range intercepting antimissile missiles. Thus the antimissile defense system and weapons being created [sozdat] under this program are, as I have stressed, weapons which the creators of this system claim are absolute. But there are no such weapons, so that the emergence of a new kind of weaponry, as is being developed [razrabotat] under the SDI program, will inevitably give rise to countermeasures, that is, there will arise a new impetus for the arms race, an arms race in both defensive and offensive weapons.

[Zubkov] We will undoubtedly be looking at this again in the second part of our program, but now, Vitaliy Iosifovich, would you please outline the scientific aspects of the SDI program? What is the essence of it?

[Goldanskiy] Well, it seems to me you could put it this way, that it concerns the development [razrabotka] of scientific and technological aspects of a very wide range of pulsed destructive effects on matter. And as Yuriy Viktorovich has already said, it is a matter of effects which will be implemented both in space and from space; that is, all the means for creating such effects would be connected with space or put into space. I would also like to stress that in the program, a very great role, a big part, is given over to planning for the maximum use of computerization; that is, there is an extremely broad application of computer technology. In essence, the destiny of mankind is being entrusted more and more to computers. This is particularly dangerous, since less and less time is given to making various decisions on different signals while the complexity of the task that has to be performed becomes greater and greater.

As far as these pulsed attack effects themselves are concerned, what is the meaning of pulsed effects here? Basically it is a matter of compressing the energy at our disposal as much as possible, either in time, that is, increasing the power of the effect by making it a very short-lived and powerful pulse, or, compressing it in space, which is even more to the point in this case, in the framework of this program.

Speaking specifically about one of the important elements of the SDI program, this means a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser -- you hear about this very often. What do they have in mind? What they have in mind is that the energy of a nuclear explosion, which in a normal nuclear weapon is spread equally in all directions, should be concentrated in certain given directions by the rays, the several dozens of rays, of this X-ray laser.

Thus the energy is provided by the explosion itself, while the effect is directed so that the power in these chosen directions becomes extremely enhanced. So it is clear that we are dealing with the task of creating [sozdaniye] what are weapons based truly on new principles.

[Zubkov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, of course we shall be returning frequently to the political aspects of SDI, which have become important in resolving the problem of nuclear disarmament. But could you begin by speaking about how important the SDI program now is for the whole of today's international situation?

[Bessmertnykh] I think we have already established that this concerns the creation [sozdaniye] of a new kind of weapon, not a type but a kind. We have spoken a little about the fact that ways exist for the scientific-technological attainment of this aim. All this is yet to come, to a certain extent; that is, the program is gathering pace. As a political problem, however, SDI already exists. It is already hampering international life, it is undermining opportunities to achieve accord, and it is complicating in the extreme the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States, as is shown by the meetings between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan last year in Geneva and in Reykjavik in October this year. In fact, the problem of SDI was pivotal and central at these meetings as well. That is, as a political problem, SDI is a very resounding one, if one could put it like that.

Furthermore, the specific effect of SDI on talks and on public opinion lies in the fact that, as I see it, we are dealing with one of the greatest mystifications that has ever occurred -- political mystifications, that is. SDI has been given a very attractive package, and Mikhail Sergeyevich once said plainly about this, that it is attractive packaging for very suspicious and dangerous goods. It is particularly dangerous right now precisely because it upsets the normal course of international affairs, normal contacts and dialogue, and just as the iceberg kept undermining the Titanic, so this undermines the possibility of progress on the most vital issues of our times. And so it is understandable that it is the political aspect of SDI -- and by the way we have borrowed the name SDI from the Americans, in fact it has been created by all the yardsticks of advertising, it means Strategic Defense Initiative; all the words are very fine, but the essence of SDI is very ominous. And so in order for us to carefully come to grips with this problem, once again we must look behind these fine words, which are very attractive, and I think that is what we shall be doing today.

[Zubkov] Thank you very much. Now what we are waiting for from you, Andronik Melkonovich, is for you to speak about whether SDI is really a defense initiative, as indicated in its own terms, or whether it is an offensive weapon, and so, could you begin with this?

[Petrosyants] From the brief conversations so far it is very clear that SDI is by no means a shield, by no means a defense but an outright offensive weapon. SDI as a shield is an unconcealed propaganda trick, behind which they are trying, or so far have been trying, to conceal direct action weapons. And (?you have all) spoken quite correctly concerning the fact that SDI will in its turn force a counteraction. Every action has its reaction.

[Zubkov] Unfortunately, that is a fact. The first questions are already coming in, and one is from Comrade Aleksandr Alekseyevich Nagorniy from Moscow: Is there any point in taking any notice of SDI? Perhaps we should ignore it and deal with our own problems.

[Petrosyants] Well, I'll go on anyway, thank you. What I want to say is this, that SDI has as its foundation the X-ray laser with a nuclear pump. And what is that? It combines a high level of power (?removed from a unit of volume of the medium) with a high level of energy in the pulse. And Vitaliy put it very well.

It is indeed in this respect that the carrying out of nuclear explosions is very important. Without the carrying out of nuclear explosions, without those, neither we nor anyone else would get any nuclear pump. And, what's more, this is why the United States are insisting so stubbornly on continuing nuclear explosions. Of course there is a whole range of other considerations, too, but these include precisely this: the obtaining of a nuclear-pumped X-ray laser.

[Zubkov] As we expected, very many questions have already come in -- here they are gathered together in a single bundle. These are the questions, but essentially they are boil down to this: How are we going to respond to the SDI program? What will our response be? Albert Petrovich Limakov, an engineer from Moscow; Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zagasin, an electrician; Nikolayev, a lathe operator from Nikolayev; and other comrades ask about this. Perhaps we will first of all give an answer to these and then continue the discussion, Yuriy Viktorovich?

[Lebedev] Yes, we certainly must answer these questions.

[Zubkov] Essentially the questions boil down to one thing: How are we going to be able to reply? Those that I have read, this bundle of questions, put it in different words, but, yes, go on.

[Lebedev] Essentially the questions are about what it is that makes SDI dangerous.

[Zubkov] And they are about our countermeasures.

[Lebedev] Yes, and they are about our countermeasures. But I have already said that SDI first and foremost is a weapon, and primarily an offensive weapon, first because this weapon, in space augments the strategic offensive potential possessed by the United States; that is to say, this weapon, deployed in space, is capable of creating the illusion that the possibility of a Soviet retaliatory strike would be undermined. In that event there could be those capable of reaching out for the "button" in order to try and test their strength. Consequently, this is fraught with the danger of war breaking out. Besides, these weapons, deployed in space, are intended to destroy the eyese and ears of the other side, and I am referring to the struggle against the satellites, the artificial earth satellites, the purpose of which is to monitor [kontrol] and to give early warning of missile attack. In destroying them the enemy could, of course, find himself in a difficult situation. So all of this is aimed at creating conditions for delivering a first nuclear strike.

[Zubkov] (?Defense comes afterwards)

[Lebedev] Certainly. But of course hopes of achieving any rights of that kind for the United States remain illusory. The Soviet Union is a state which is capable of responding in a fitting way to intrigues which threaten its defensive capability. What ways do we choose for this? We have great possibilities. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already spoken of the fact that our scientists and our engineers have been given the task: They are working on the measures that we can pit against SDI. It has to be stated directly that both U.S. and Soviet scientists have said that measures, countermeasures, against SDI can be much cheaper, much simpler, and developed much more quickly than the antimissile system itself which is being developed [sozdavatsya] under the SDI program. Even Western specialists say that both defensive means and active -- that is to say, offensive -- means can be used here. What are the means that we will choose? Well, evidently this will be decided by our specialists depending upon the situation that comes about.

One thing is clear: We are of course not going to go along the road that the United States is proposing to us. We are going to choose our own road. And I think that that road will be effective and that the U.S. antimissile defense will of course not allow the United States to hope that the Soviet Union will be incapable, in a counterstrike, of giving a fitting response to those plans which the United States is currently hatching.

[Zubkov] Thank you. Boris Aleksandrovich, could you tell us about the arguments that are being used by Western propaganda in support of the SDI program?

[Kalyagin] The main argument used by U.S. propaganda, by the U.S. Administration, is to be found in the title of this program: It is called a defense initiative, and we have already spoken about that. That is why President Reagan took offense when Edward Kennedy, the well-known Democratic senator, called this program "Star Wars." But no matter what President Reagan did in his attempts to get rid of this very meaningful description, nothing came of it; it became fixed very firmly to that concept. And so U.S. propaganda asserts that what is intended is the development [sozdaniye] of defensive nonnuclear weapons that are targeted not against people but only against nuclear missiles, and that in the event of their being launched, in the event of their being used as first-strike weapons, they do not, before, represent any danger to us. But this has already been discussed very well by other participants in this meeting.

I can add further the fact that SDI envisages the development [sozdaniye] of weapons with a range of 4-5,000 km. What kind of defensive weapon is that? It is an all-purpose weapon, and of course it can be used for all purposes.

And there is also the following argument which President Reagan likes to use, that SDI will lead to the withering away, to the obsolescence, of nuclear weapons and will render them unnecessary -- in other words, the role virtually of deliverer of mankind from the nuclear threat is being ascribed to the Star Wars program, to the SDI program. But the U.S. Administration is playing upon the fear that people quite naturally have in the face of the nuclear threat. Reagan sometimes says that the concept of mutual assured nuclear destruction is in effect immoral, that it must be replaced, and that SDI will help to do that.

Well, indeed, such a concept does exist. It means that an outbreak of nuclear conflict is deterred by the understanding that in it there will be no victor, that both sides have enough weapons to destroy each other. We do not consider this to be an ideal situation either. And we have proposed a clear and direct path -- the path of rejection of nuclear weapons, which has been set down in the well-known historic statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. In Reykjavik, too, we proposed that strategic arms should be given up and that there should be no embarking upon SDI.

All would appear to be clear, but the United States is refusing. Reagan says that SDI is essential as an insurance policy for the United States. An insurance policy against whom? If we agree to eliminate strategic nuclear arms there will be no ballistic missiles, so against whom is the insurance policy? It could be better described as an insurance policy for the arms manufacturers, one that will guarantee them increased profits. But the United States -- particularly the President himself -- says that at some time a madman will suddenly make his appearance and will want to reinvent nuclear weapons and use them against the United States for purposes of blackmail. But in my view making sledgehammers for cracking nuts is a much more sensible proposal than the version proposed by the President, that $1 trillion -- and now they are even saying that it will be more than that -- should be spent, and that hundreds of thousands of tons of the most complicated equipment should be put into space purely because a madman might turn up.

In my opinion making guns to shoot sparrows would be a much more reasonable proposal than the option being proposed by the President. And, furthermore, if those crazy terrorists do appear, they are most likely to use not a ballistic missile, which is difficult to construct and still more difficult to conceal; they would use a different, miniconventional method, so to speak, like a concealed van in which they could convey a nuclear warhead; so SDI would be of no avail. There are, of course, quite a few other arguments. For instance, it is claimed that the Soviet Union is very afraid of SDI, that it was SDI that forced us to sit down for talks. I think it would be better if Aleksandr Aleksandrovich answered this question.

[Zubkov] There are already some questions.

[Bessmertnykh] There are some questions. I would like to start with an interesting question. It is asked by Comrade Viktor Borisovich Maslov, from the town of Nezhinsk: What are the Americans counting on? It is a very simple and clear question. I think, if it were like that, everything would be simple; the conspiracy would be so obvious, the whole world could see the offensive weapons. Well, in that case, why is this program still on the wave of public support; in America it is even quite popular, and so on?

The question cuts to the core of the subject, so to speak. I think in order to understand the SDI program more thoroughly, the task of creating [sozdaniye] the new type of weapons of which we speak has to be placed in the context of strategy. Without that, nothing can be understood. I would not want anyone to gain the impression that this weapon is precisely and only of an offensive nature. This is the feeling we may be getting in this discussion. No. this weapon possesses both an offensive element and also a very strong defensive element. So, where does its danger lie?

The very strategic concept of the United States now is definitely offensive, and this weapon inserted in the core of this concept provides its really dangerous nature. Why? Well, insofar as the offensive element exists, it is clear: An offensive element is a weapon or an offensive type of weapon that destroys something. Either it will destroy our systems in space -- not only missiles -- or it will destroy targets on earth. But the defensive part of this concept is not quite understood, although I consider it to be no less dangerous than the offensive part.

Here you have already correctly said, comrades, that it is impossible to create a 100 percent impenetrable system, such a shield as would protect the United States from offensive types of weapons from, say, the other side. But the Americans -- experts are stressing this now -- realize that such a system cannot be created. So it is a question of creating a kind of umbrella with holes in it. And, of course, an umbrella with holes in it is no use to us when we get into a downpour, although it may play its part when it drizzles. And herein lies the dangerous defensive part of the system. For it is a non-100 percent system that ensures, provides a temptation to mount a nuclear first strike. What is the calculation? A strike would be mounted against Soviet strategic systems, against its administrative systems. Naturally, the weakened retaliatory strike wouldn't be a nuclear downpour but something weaker, and the Americans reckon they will be able to cope with that, with the help of this system.

Incidentally, there is a very important aspect which has to be borne in mind. They have been saying, especially Reagan, and for some time his secretary of defense, Weinberger, that the SDI system will replace nuclear weapons. So far he is showing us that this is not so. All systems of offensive strategic weapons are starting to be developed at accelerated rates, like the MX missiles, for instance. It is very curious that they are being located in the silos of existing Minuteman missiles.

Quite recently -- Yuriy Viktorovich will confirm this -- the United States was saying that the Minuteman missiles were very vulnerable because they were located in silos. So why now are the MX's going to be shoved down the same silos? Because they will be useful in the event of a first strike, that is, if the Soviet missiles get to the area of these missile fields there will not be any MX's there. They will have left already, so to speak.

[Zubkov] There are now some specific questions to do with our second, more fundamental part, on the plans and realities of SDI. Here is a specific question about the nuclear laser trigger and other, more detailed ones, but as an introductory visual preface we also want to show a small firm clip, which we now offer you.

[passage omitted: 3-minute video film shows the history of wars from the earliest times to the present time, beginning with old swords and guns, the earliest planes, World War II footage, modern film of missiles, killer satellites, and ending with "Star Wars" film footage]

[Zubkov] Good, well, we now come to the second part of our program in which we have decided to discuss the SDI plans, that is the actual real projects and the realities which now exist. Here there are many questions which boil down to one thing, which we will cover in more detail now, about what the United States has managed to do in the past years for a real implementation of the SDI program. Well, we could start with you, Vitaliy Iosifovich, because if I am not mistaken you have personally and directly visited all, or rather, one of the three U.S. laboratories where the SDI program is being developed [razrabatyvayetsya].

[Goldanskiy] Yes, several years ago I went to Los Alamos, the main laboratory for SDI.

[Zubkov] What does it look like? Is it an underground fort, or what?

[Goldanskiy] No, no. It is a plateau in New Mexico; there is a little brook flowing there. At one time, 40 years ago, it was entirely desert; then it was chosen for developing the Manhattan Project there. Now it is a typical U.S. township not far from the big city of Santa Fe. There is a residential town there as well, near the laboratory itself, which was for a long time the main weapons laboratory of the United States.

[Zubkov] And what went on inside?

[Goldanskiy] As for what went on inside, naturally I did not see everything that went on there. However, when I was there, I met in particular with people who worked at Los Alamos with another type of problem concerning shortwave lasers, including those in the Angstrom range -- this is the so-called Gamma laser. Well, we had meetings with them and it should be said that, even prior to that, people from this laboratory, just like people from Livermore, visited the Soviet Union and took part in a conference held in Novosibirsk in 1974, organized at that time by Rem Viktorovich Khokhlov, our very prominent scientist who at that time was also dealing with this problem. Incidentally, one of the questions here...

[Zubkov, interrupting] Is about nuclear pumping, yes?

[Goldanskiy] Well, there are not many questions about X-ray pumping lasers or, generally, about the nuclear aspect...

[Zubkov, interrupting] If at all possible, explain this in layman's terms as much as possible.

[Goldanskiy] Well, I have already tried to say a little about this and I wish to say that maybe later on I will return to it, but here we have a question from Bursak, an engineer from Moscow; that promises were made in the United States to hand over to the USSR the SDI technology. Will a direct request be made along diplomatic channels concerning the transfer of this technology? Well, at the end of my reply, maybe I will say a few words on this score.

Well, first and foremost, I wish yet again to emphasize that the nuclear aspect is a very important part of the SDI program. It is, in essence, the transfer of nuclear arms to space, thus constituting a violation of the entire system of treaties, beginning with the 1967 Space Treaty, and the 1972 ABM Treaty -- which is basically the foundation of security and is an international treaty. It is also the main obstacle to be found at present to the halting of nuclear tests. I had occasion to see this for myself for the umpteenth time 2 months ago when I was in Canada, attending a very specialized and, I would say, a very responsible conference on monitoring and banning nuclear tests. This was attended by people from both Livermore and Los Alamos.

Well, the fact that it is proposed to bring nuclear arms for SDI into space is giving rise, one must say, to a great deal of indignation among numerous U.S. scientists, and this serves as a very important argument for them. Maybe toward the end, when we have returned to the question of who is for and who is against SDI, I would like to analyze the U.S. scientists' views more extensively; here I would just like to quote from what possibly are very typical letters.

Well, an American writes, that is to say a U.S. physicist writes in the magazine PHYSICS TODAY -- he is a man who earlier, in 1983, in the same journal supported the Presidential initiative -- that over the past few years SDI activities have dramatically increased in scope. One direction of SDI which worries me more than any other is the development of X-ray lasers pumped by nuclear explosions. This approach to SDI not only contradicts the nonnuclear defense announced by President Reagan, it can also lead to a dangerously unstable situation which will render the very concept of SDI ineffective. The deployment [razmeshcheniye] in space of nuclear weapons, even if for defensive purposes, will inevitably lead to the development of offensive nuclear space arms, thereby invalidating the SDI concept.

Here we have yet another precise statement. It is of particular interest in view of the fact that it is a statement by (Silan Rockwood), director of the SDI department in Los Alamos. He writes: What would you think if a satellite of this kind -- he is referring here to a space-based X-ray laser [words indistinct]. Well, he is talking of just one of them. Multiply this by thousands and you will then get the same question in an even bolder relief. What would you think if a satellite of this kind passed over Washington five times in any 24-hour period, knowing that nuclear arms are on board the satellite?

Would you believe that this is only defensive armament and not something that could be dropped on your head without any prior notification or warning? Well, here we have a man who has formulated the political aspect with great clarity. I will now return to this question.

[Zubkov] Let's return, because, yes, let me just, maybe I will here simply, very simply, read what was written in the paper, the French magazine LE POINT.

[Goldanskiy] Yes.

[Zubkov] Well, it is written in very simple language here; please provide a scientific commentary on this.

[Goldenskiy] Maybe I, too, will try to provide it in simple language?

[Zubkov, laughing] Now be kind enough to let me read it, yes? After a missile has been launched -- this means that these missiles are, as it were, Soviet missiles: there is talk of the enemy here -- it could be possible to explode in space a nuclear device from a U.S. submarine, a device that is compatible with a laser gun. The energy of the explosion, having turned into radiation of very great power in the laser tubes, would be turned forthwith against the enemy's missiles, thousands of kilometers away, and these missiles would be destroyed. Well, this scheme...

[Goldanskiy, interrupting] Let me try, so to speak...

[Zubkov resumes] Yes, please, so that the essence of this nuclear pumping, this nuclear explosion, is understandable. And it is necessary, because of that, generally, so to speak, to call these weapons nuclear weapons.

[Goldanskiy] Undoubtedly nuclear, since the energy needed for the laser to operate later on is created through a nuclear explosion. After all, imagine a nuclear bomb in space, of whatever capacity. This bomb is surrounded by a system of needles. Several dozen such needles contain atoms which subsequently function by the radiation of these very same X-rays. During a nuclear explosion a very great number of X-rays are released. During a normal explosion, this X-ray radiation -- as I said at the beginning -- is spread uniformly in the space surrounding the center of the explosion. In this case, the main idea is this: The X-ray radiation will immediately excite the atoms of, let us say, iron or some other element that forms part of the composition of these needles, and it will immediately excite them to such an extent that you will have more excited atoms in these needles than atoms in their basic state. I am forced to use scientific terminology a little. Then, given this, these atoms, these needles, will become not absorbers of X-ray radiation, but sources of radiation, sources of this stimulated, as they call it, X-ray radiation. And that is why the energy of the explosion is transformed into the energy of X-ray radiation, but this time it is guided radiation. The X-rays will be directed, guided along the direction the needles are facing.

The computers' task in all this -- and maybe it is this that shows right away just how insanely complex this whole task is, just how unrealisitic is this task of this alleged defense initiative -- a task to be performed in very short time intervals -- the computers are supposed to recognize and identify the missiles in flight and, moreover, to orient each and every needle in such a way that the X-ray it emits is directed against some specific missile, whose trajectory must be computed with the speed of lightning, and thus several dozen missiles would be hit simultaneously.

Well, that is the basis of the X-ray laser. Another question that I have here...

[Zubkov, interrupting] I have a request: Please let us have questions that are somewhat shorter, since we have very many questions, so that we shall be able to answer most of them.

[Goldanskiy] I think that scientific questions are less comprehensible, and maybe this is the reason why it is necessary to explain them in greater detail. And the question here is this: Won't the nuclear pumping, with the aid of nuclear explosions, lead to a nuclear winter? Nuclear winter is an extraordinarily dangerous thing, one that generally threatens mankind's existence in the event of a nuclear war, but the pumping of these lasers has no direct bearing on nuclear winter. The only bearing it has is that it increases the danger of nuclear war, because nuclear winter comes about as a consequence of explosions taking place in cities, in forests, where enormous quantities of dust are thereby thrown up into the atmosphere.

[Zubkov] Furthermore, there are some questions, some very specific and practical questions along the same lines and dealing with approximately the same subject. Take, say, the question from Comrade Lev Georgiyevich Kovalev, who is an electrical engineer. He asks, Yuriy Viktorovich, what will happen to the warheads when missiles are intercepted in the air, say, and hit? Will they explode? This question is for you, Comrade General. And where will they explode?

[Lebedev] How is the question put? Please repeat it for me.

[Zubkov] If missiles are intercepted will their warheads explode or will they not explode? Where will they fall, these nuclear explosions? Where will they take place? In the atmosphere? On earth?

[Lebedev] If they are intercepted by our means, these...

[Zubkov, interrupting] No, it means by the U.S. defensive means.

[Lebedev] Ah, by the U.S ones, is that it? Yes, certainly they will explode, and the scenario of intercepting warheads, say, during the final part of the trajectory of intercontinental ballistic missiles, is an extremely risky venture, for I want to say that these warheads can be created [sozdany] in such a way that they will have some kind of time fuses [distantsionnyy vzryvatel] and these explosions, taking place over cities, will still inflict very serious losses upon cities, both upon the population and the targets themselves.

[Zubkov] Thank you. There have been some very important questions dealing with international affairs connected wtih SDI.

[Bessmertnykh] I think that our discussion is getting to this point because it's getting quite useful with everything that we've been talking about. Perhaps we ought to be fighting to ensure that this doesn't happen.

[Zubkov] We have questions not just from Moscow and from other cities in our country, but from Bratislava, too, so (?I mention it) especially.

[Bessmertnykh] Comrade Andrey Gennadiyevich Kondrakov from Moscow asks the following question: In his speech, Comrade Gorbachev said that we are not afraid of the SDI program. Why, then, did he not sign the treaty? There is a similar question from Akim Sadykovich Yakubov, a driver from Moscow. And Roni Ataliyevich Zadayev put it like this: When are we going to stop indulging this actor from the United States?

I feel that it is not just the scientific and technical aspects of the problem but the political ones, too, that are not all that clear to all our comrades, for they really are very, very complex. What happened at the talks? And what are we speaking about when we say we are not afraid of SDI? We really are not afraid of the SDI as a military program -- this was stated by our party general secretary -- insofar as possible countermeasures to possible alternative forms of deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the very weapons themselves are already being studied. Scientists and military specialists have been given tasks and, as far as I understand it, they have worked out definite responses and concepts of responses directly as far as the weapons are concerned.

However, why then did we not enter into some accords concerning nuclear arms reduction in Reykjavik? The fact is that while we have no fear of SDI as a military and technical problem, we see all the enormous dangers of this program for the overall military and strategic situation and for the survival of mankind as a whole.

Why? Well, in the first place because new types of armaments are being brought into being, and we have already discussed this aspect. We do not even know yet what they will be like. Here we are sketching some possibilities that our imagination suggests to us. However, perhaps there will also be something quite different.

Besides this, SDI spurs on the modernization of armaments in the whole broad spectrum of both strategic and even conventional armaments. These armaments are capable of taking something from this program. But the main thing is the fact that SDI, if it is deployed [razvernut], would inevitably lead to a situation in which the other country, even before a conflict has broken out -- so far we have been sorting out conflict situations, but once the missiles fly we shoot them down and vice versa -- now the most likely situation might be one in which the SDI system has been developed [sozdavat] but that nevertheless the missiles are not in flight. [sentence as heard] And by the very fact of its existence, and even by the fact of its imminence, SDI is destabilizing the international situation.

What happened at Reykjavik? We put forward broad and far-reaching proposals: That strategic offensive weapons should be cut completely over a 10-year period, first cutting them by 50 percent, and then by a further 50 percent, or in other words taking them down to zero; that medium-range missiles in Europe should be eliminated completely; that medium-range missiles should be reduced to 100 warheads in Asia, and that the United States would get the same number. But just imagine a situation in which the United States would develop [sozdavat] this self-same SDI, the offensive and defensive component of which is now so clear to us, at the same time as we undertake such serious measures for real disarmament. And what did the United States demand and ask for in Reykjavik? In the first place that they should be permitted to carry out research and tests of this system in space; and in the second place that they should be given the right in any event 10 years from now to deploy this system, irrespective of the way in which things are going with us.

Under such conditions, which really place our security in such a serious situation, could the soviet side undertake such far-reaching scenarios, shall we say, of nuclear disarmament? That is simply impossible because then we would naturally be in a very complicated military and strategic situation. Besides SDI, the United States would of course also be left with its forward-based system in Europe and so on and so forth.

Political and state caution, therefore, obliges us to achieve a situation in which SDI is not deployed. We gave the Americans the possibility of doing some work on it, so to speak, to research it, to test it in laboratories, by all means, but let that be enough.

[Lebedev] I would like to add to what Aleksandr Aleksandrovich has been saying here: Comrade Valeriy Petrovich Voynov from Moscow continues in a way what Aleksandr Aleksandrovich has been saying. He says that if we reached an agreement on disarmament in Reykjavik, then what would there be left for the United States to defend itself against? Well, the question and an accord about nuclear disarmament being possible was indeed specifically raised in Reykjavik. And our proposals were accepted by the U.S. side. And of course in that case SDI would appear to be quite unnecessary; there would be nothing to defend themselves against; no nuclear weapons. But evidently the fact that the United States has made the SDI into an obstacle to the implementation of this practical accord shows that words about being committed to nuclear disarmament remain for the present nothing more than words, and that the United States is not prepared for nuclear disarmament.

[Zubkov] There are some related questions about the talks in Reykjavik; It's a fairly interesting question.

[Bessmertnykh] Were we counting on the agreement of the United States during the statement [as heard] by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and during the talks in Iceland or in Geneva? Were we able to count on the opposite being the case? And what conclusions ought to be drawn from this? That is to say, were we counting on reaching an accord? The concept of the meeting in Reykjavik, and of the meeting in Geneva before that, amounted to this, to proving and demonstrating to the President -- if he still failed to see this -- the whole of the dangerous consequences that go hand in hand with his program.

Mikhail Sergeyevich understood perfectly that Reagan had linked his political fate with this program. He is very committed to it. And taking, so to speak, a step toward meeting the U.S. President, he proposed that they should sort out carefully what it is about. In Geneva the U.S. President was told directly by our general secretary: We understand that you are very much involved and attracted by this problem; I have asked scientists and specialists to sort it out, and I report to you the conclusions that we have reached. This is where the danger of this program lies. Let's think it out together, let's think about how this can be avoided. In Reykjavik there was a second discussion, a very serious one, once again with the evidence produced, with very convincing arguments.

So, our policy on this is absolutely pragmatic, realistic; no one is floating in the clouds, thinking that the United States would give up SDI after two sets of talks. Finally, we have not yet asked them to give up the SDI program. This point has to be borne in mind. We have said to them: Please, we know from our calculations what SDI is. Our experts have given us the answer. If you are still not convinced, Mr President, go on studying in the laboratory; you have 10 years. Don't leave it, look into it, and you will come to the conclusions that we have obviously come to. If you reach such conclusions, then you must of course draw the only correct conclusion from them, namely that security must be gained by liquidating the nuclear weapons against which you are creating this SDI. Why are you taking such a crazy roundabout way to security by creating some kind of shield, weapons that can be simply directly destroyed, to ensure security that way?

So, there was no mood of unfounded expectations; it was an attempt to convince the U.S. President by serious argument of the need once more to give a well considered, responsible answer as to where all this was leading.

[Zubkov] We are coming to the third section of our program, to these questions -- and there are very many of them -- as to who is for and who is against SDI. Well, the position of our Soviet Government and leadership has already been partially expounded in your replies, but before we go on to this section of the program I would like you to see a small film subject, another figurative, visual epigraph to the third section of our program. It is a song, because today after all, people are expressing themselves for and against SDI not only in discussions, at demonstrations or at meetings, but with their songs. One of them will now be heard. It is a song sung by Harry Belafonte. Remember that he heads the organization Cultural and Artistic Figures for Nuclear Disarmament. The song has been going for some time and began as the hymn of the U.S. black civil-rights movement. Then it became the song of the campaign against intervention, against the U.S. war in Indochina, in Vietnam. Now people opposing nuclear disarmament are taking this song into the streets. So, the song. [passage omitted: video showing Greenham Common and then Oktoberfest in Munich, with Harry Belafonte leading the singing of "We Shall Overcome"]

[Zubkov continues] There are very many questions. We thank you for them and will try to answer most of them. Later we will answer you in our other programs. Many of your questions are about the situation not being irreversible. That is the gist of these questions.

I recall a conversation with you and your marvelous quotation from a great scientist about this criminality and uncertainty, and what tremendous danger there is in these experiments.

[Goldanskiy] Yes, I remember. It is about the whole logic of the development of science. The fact is, as a rule, science, fundamental science, and its fundamental technical consequences are unpredictable, and in this context there is a very interesting example. In 1933 Rutherford, a man who can perhaps be called the creator of nuclear physics, said: Anyone who expects to obtain energy from the transformation of the atom is talking nonsense. That was said 6 years before the discovery of fission, 9 years before the first reactor, and 12 years before Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

[Zubkov] That's unpredictability.

[Goldanskiy] That's unpredictability. Now, under conditions when there is industrialization of unconventional science, when studying high energy physics costs an enormous amount of money -- accelerators used in peaceful research and delving into the secrets of matter are specific targets -- it is now proposed to devote a trillion dollars to expand pulse strike destructive effect. Such is the deliberate aim of the research.

I think that it is hard to say now what will be the entire scale and depth of what will come of this. Imagine, in 1933, someone saying: I will develop and invest money in the nucleus and in 10 years I will tell you what has come of it. You can imagine quite well what came of that. Now this is not $2 billion like the Manhattan Project, but a trillion dollars. So this is an economic challenge, too. It is a drive to economically undermine, ruin all rivals by a kind of game of all-or-nothing without a precise understanding of what finally...

[Zubkov, interrupting] And you know countermeasures...

[Goldanskiy, interrupting] They are cheaper...

[Zubkov] Cheaper maybe, but countermeasures bring counter-countermeasures, and counter-countermeasures bring counter-counter-counter-countermeasures, so the question of ruination, it will cost...

[Goldanskiy, interrupting] Instead of disarming, there is this drive to stake more and more, like a gambler, putting more and more and more on the bank.

[Zubkov] Your answers, please.

[Petrosyants] Vitaliy Iosifovich has just snuck in with what I wanted to say. We are talking about SDI. We are going on as if it was a fait accompli, a reality. Nothing of the sort! SDI today is just a project in rough, as we engineers say. SDI faces tremendous scientific and still greater technical difficulties.

That is why it is correctly said that it will require, firstly, much time, many years, and an extraordinarily great sum of money and material resources. Incidentally, it seems to me for some reason that, well, they often say and I know this, I have read this, that President Reagan is devoted to the SDI and that it is his obsession. I think that indeed, the current White House administration daydreams about the laurels President Roosevelt won when he helped implement the creation of an atomic bomb.

They daydream about the laurels of President Truman who dropped, ordered to drop, atomic bombs on Japanese cities during the war. Well, President Reagan's picture is also more or less like this: maybe something will come out of this? Here he is bringing enormous levers into play, enormous resources. This, of course, must be borne in mind and fought. With what can one fight it? It seems to me that there is only one thing: It is beyond doubt, essential that the public opinion in the countries throughout the world should categorically oppose it and that it should demand of the U.S. Administration that it halts nuclear testing. If there are no nuclear explosions, neither will there be nuclear pumping, nor will there be the SDI. This is one of the most radical questions and it is necessary to fight for it with all one's might. If we manage to do this, we will attain what we desire. I have here a number of questions.

[Zubkov] Please, please, go ahead, we are listening to you, yes.

[Petrosyants] Well, I think that these questions are, more or less, concerned with this. Well, one question which, incidentally, crops up again, is about nuclear winter: How long does it last, what influence will it have on man, will man survive it, and so forth.

Well, I am bound to say that if there is, indeed, nuclear war, then you will have a violation of our planet on a global scale, of the atmosphere, troposphere, the earth, and so on. It is something that is incalculable. That is why mankind should remove the question of nuclear war from the agenda. There is nothing that would make it possible to counteract this global destruction during a nuclear war.

The next question is from Vadim Yefimovich Korotkov, war veteran from the city of Moscow. Do the tests carried out in testing ranges -- nuclear test ranges are what is in mind here -- have any influence upon volcanic eruptions or earthquakes? Well, it must be said that nuclear explosions are, properly speaking, tiny earthquakes, incidentally speaking. In what sense are they tiny? What charges must be used? Smaller, or maybe bigger? No cases have so far been found involving nuclear explosions causing a spontaneous, natural earthquake. But if these explosions are carried out in regions of seismic activity, it is very probable that they will have an influence and an earthquake will entail.

[Zubkov] Boris Aleksandrovich, would you like to give a brief list of attitudes toward the SDI, who is for it, who is against it, both in the United States itself and in the Soviet Union?

[Kalyagin] I am afraid that there are very many questions here.

[Zubkov] That's perfectly true, perfectly true.

[Kalyagin] Let me start by giving a short question that perhaps has no direct bearing on the SDI. Svetlana Mikhaylovna Romanova asks why television was not directly present during the talks between both sides in Reykjavik. Well, it is quite clear why -- so as not to be in the way of the participants in the talks conducting their dialogue.

Television was in Reykjavik and it did some filming, but the talks and, in particular, a significant part of the talks were conducted eye-to-eye, between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan, with only interpreters present. Everything was done to facilitate the conducting of a dialogue. Well, Valeriy Petrovich Burkovskiy from Moscow asks how many countries support the SDI program. Well, I have to say that an overwhelming majority of countries are against this program and even numerous U.S. partners in the alliances and agreements are also against it.

In particular, I can name countries that have announced their unwillingness to be involved in the SDI on the state level -- for instance Australia, Canada, France, Norway, Denmark, and Greece.

Five, so to speak, closest partners are in support of the SDI program: Great Britain, the FRG, Italy, Israel, and Japan. Moreover, these decisions were also not arrived at immediately. If we take, let us say, a partner such as Great Britain, one of the closest partners -- I would say that its attitude to the Star Wars program does not, to put it mildly, stand out by its consistency. In the first place we remember the statement made by Howe, the foreign secretary, in which the SDI program was criticized. It was said in London that there is opposition there against deployment of arms in space. But Mrs Margaret Thatcher arrived in the United States, held talks with Reagan in Camp David, and naturally pressure was applied on her. She said there that Great Britain supported the SDI and supported the SDI research program, but if the question of deploying an antimissile system in space arises, then the Soviet Union and the United States should sit down at the negotiating table. A kind of proviso was made here, showing that London is, as it were, ultimately against the deployment of antimissile weapons in space.

It continues to be said in Britain that they are in favor of, so to speak, a firm observance of the Soviet-American ABM Treaty of 1972. Well, generally speaking, a consistent implementation of the SDI will lead to this treaty being undermined. That is why there is, of course, and without a doubt, an inconsistency in this position. Well, attempting to justify their policy, the British Conservatives say that if they failed to join in the SDI they would begin to lag behind in modern technology. Prime Minister Thatcher herself even said that, having joined in the SDI, Great Britain has been given an opportunity of exerting influence upon the formation of U.S. policies arising from the SDI agreement. Well, it seems to me that all these arguments are rather illusory. In the first place, we know that the current U.S. Administration pursues its policies without regard to the interests of even its partners, and that it sometimes fails to consult them. At times these policies are pursued in secret from them, as has, for instance, been shown by the Irangate affair. As for the opportunity of joining in the use of the state-of-the-art technology, we have, for the time being, seen the reverse process: On the contrary, it is the United States that is trying to get its hands upon the best minds and achievements in Western Europe and other Western countries, so as to develop the SDI with their aid.

Here Alla Mikhaylovna Rappaport from the second group of those who live in Moscow asks what Japan is counting on, after having joined in the SDI program. After all, the Japanese themselves experienced the effects of atomic bombs. And, after all, nuclear weapons are now much more powerful -- or else did they have in mind something in the way of protection against radiation? No, no such protection has been devised as yet, not in Japan or anywhere else.

It must be said that in Japan, support for the SDI was not a simple matter, either. For a long time the Nakasone government pretended that it was hesitating, that it was unable to arrive at a decision. This is explained rather easily. In the first place, the very constitution of Japan bans the waging of war and the buildup of arms. In the second place, there exist three so-called nuclear-free principles against the import or manufacture of nuclear weapons on the territory of Japan. Finally, there were resolutions of the Japanese parliament concerning the use of space only for peaceful purposes. Well, in the end, the Nakasone government finally discarded this mask of irresoluteness and announced its support for SDI. Moreover, it tries to sell its position also by reference to the fact that the SDI is an American program and that is why the resolutions of Japan's parliament do not affect it. As for the nuclear-free principles, again the nuclear testing is done on the territory of the United States and not on the territory of Japan. That is also why this is neither here nor there, as far as that country is concerned.

What is most important, a treaty on security has been concluded between Japan and the United States. It follows from this treaty that the Japanese should support the United States. Well, this shows once more how dangerous this treaty is.

How many years is the SDI program calculated to take? What is the attitude of Americans themselves to the program? Are they aware of the danger of all this? Well, it is surely rather complicated to say how many years this program is calculated to last. What is known is that in the period of 1983-1986 already $4.2 million have been spent on its implementation. In the 1987-1991 period it is planned to spend a further $3-4 billion. Well, how long the United States intend to continue will, apparently, depend on the results obtained.

(?We proposed to Reagan) that for 10 years, research on the SDI program should be confined to the laboratory and should not be carried out in space. At the same time we made great concessions and great compromises for the sake of getting this agreement. Yet, nevertheless, the United States did not agree. If you will permit me I will give you a very interesting quotation from Edward Markey, chairman of a subcommittee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, who said that in Reykjavik Reagan was offered the best deal the Russians have ever offered an American President since the time of the Alaska purchase. All the President had to give in return was a promise that the United States will continue to strictly adhere to the 1972 ABM Treaty. But the President refused and was wrong. That is Markey's view.

In this connection, the questioner asks: What is the attitude to the SDI program of the possible Democratic and Republican Party candidates for the U.S. Presidency? The politicians have not yet put forward their nominations; the elections do not take place until 1988, but we can say that there are some figures in the Democratic Party who sharply condemn this program. We have already talked about Edward Kennedy. We can also mention Jesse Jackson, one of the contenders last time for the Democratic Party. Gary Hart has been in Moscow, as you recall, and he was asked a direct question by a television correspondent about his attitude to SDI. I would say that he gave a veiled reply, although there was a report yesterday that he has called for restrictions on the SDI program, so his position as such is not absolutely clear. Perhaps Aleksandr Aleksandrovich can add something.

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, some very curious processes are taking place in the United States, and in Congress in particluar, right now. First of all, Reagan and Weinberger's number one fairytale about an impenetrable shield being created has crumbled, one can say. Out of all the major figures, they are virtually the only two who still try to say something on this topic. The remainder talk about a completely different SDI, about a partial SDI, and so on and so forth. But it must be admitted that the current U.S. President -- and until recently he has been fairly popular -- has nevertheless managed to secure a situation in which the broad public supports this program. We judge this by the so-called public opinion polls that are carried out by sociological institutes of different kinds. However, I must reveal in a couple of words the secret of all this. If someone asked you the following question: "Do you want to support the SDI program which will ensure your complete survival or do you want to fall victim to the ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union?" then of course the answer is clear. Pollsters therefore received replies indicating that between 64 and 67 percent of Americans in general are in favor of SDI. As far as Congress is concerned, there is some stratification taking place. Approximately 200 senators and congressmen come out clearly and definitely in favor of the SDI. These are conservative and right-wing figures from the Republican and Democratic Parties. All the same, there is a wider stratum in Congress that is more cautious: You were quite right there when you were talking about Hart. This is in general characteristic of the liberal section of Congress.

Not many of them speak directly like Kennedy. Nevertheless, the majority of them believe and say that they are against the SDI but are in favor of carrying out the research part all the same. The whole problem of American liberalism lies in this vagueness.

[Zubkov] Please don't forget the question from Bratislava. We promised to answer it.

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, I'm going over to it right away. While talking about the reactions of those who are in favor and those who are against, we cannot fail to deal with the question asked from Bratislava by Comrade Spanier. What is the attitude of the Third World and the developing countries to all of this? The answer here is a short one: The developing world looks with great fear at what is taking place in this area. In the first place, it is troubled by the prospects of further tension between the Soviet Union and the United States. In the second place, they see that enormous resources are starting to be spent in a nonproductive sphere, and this at a time when it is precisely hope of disarmament which is offering them the chance of seeing the wealthy North giving them the appropriate resources, so to speak, as a result of disarmament taking place. At their international conferences and in bilateral contacts, they say definitely that they are opposed to SDI.

[Zubkov] A letter -- a question -- or rather an assessment, if you like, of our program comes from Valentina Georgiyevna Safran. She has phoned it in and asks why such a small amount of time has been allocated for this interesting program with so many different questions. Well, in the first place, this has been our first experience; thank you for your assessment. We hope that we will have further discussion of the SDI, no doubt on more than one occasion, for this is an important and a crucial problem. But time is already bearing down upon us and if you will permit me we will return to the question -- there are very many of these questions: You know that the bundle...

[Unidentified voice, interrupting] There is another very important question that we haven't dealt with.

[Zubkov] We'll get back to it in a minute. [indistinct interjections by several participants speaking at once] Absolutely, and this is natural, you know, because in the first place people are entering into a discussion with us; like participants in our conversation, they naturally take an interest, and at the same time we have more to say. But nevertheless I repeat that there have been very many questions about what countermeasures our country is taking. Perhaps we are not [word indistinct] our viewers very much. I think that you wanted to sum up these questions. Please go ahead. And then we will certainly deal with [word indistinct]; these are very important questions.

[Petrosyants] In the course of this conversation we have now been talking about the way in which SDI is an enormous piece of work involving science, technology, and cash. It is impossible to carry it out just like that, whether in 1 year, in 2 years, or whatever. In this connection I want to mention the fact that the possibilities that the Soviet Union has for countermeasures, for a counter-SDI, are enormous. Our potential is so powerful that I can illustrate it with just one fact, with just one example. The United States, in developing the atomic bomb, took 2 years and 7 months from the start-up of the first research atomic reactor in Chicago; 2 years and 7 months elapsed before the test of the first atomic bomb was carried out. The Soviet Union began in 1943, during wartime, essentially a time of destruction, the army, the war. We took 2 years and 8 months from the start-up of the first research reactor. I repeat: 2 years and 7 months for the United States, the wealthiest country and one in a state of peace, in the sense that practically speaking it has not endured any war.

[Unidentified participant] Its territory (?remained inviolate).

[Petrosyants] Of course, of course. And how casualties did it suffer? As many as it loses in road accidents and other accidents and railway accidents. That's all. And we took 2 years and 8 months. That's the might of the Soviet Union! If, therefore, we really do set about preparing countermeasures we will do the job and we'll ensure its completion. But, this is something that does not have to be done. We are against this. We believe it to be unnecessary, not needed. What we have to do, therefore, is to apply our entire strength and resources -- and in this sense those of all our allies -- and the whole Third World to bring about an end to nuclear weapons tests. As soon as the testing of nuclear weapons has ended, I repeat, there won't be any X-ray laser, there won't be any nuclear pumping. It is impossible to create the same kind of pumping by other methods and by other means. It can only be done by nuclear arms.

[Bessmertnykh] Some listeners themselves suggest measures to counteract it.

[Zubkov] That's interesting.

[Bessmertnkh] Comrade Gvozdetskiy from Odessa says this: Does the designed trajectory of the SDI cross the space of the USSR? Can our law on the state border be used in order to destroy these elements even before the development [formirovaniye] of the SDI has been finished as elements violating our borders? Unfortunately the state border ends at the atmosphere. Space does not belong to any state, although I have to admit that we have not yet agreed with anyone about where the atmosphere ends and where space begins. What we propose is that this is somewhere higher than 100 to 110 kilometers. We know, therefore, that the designed trajectory of the SDI does of course cross the territory of the Soviet Union as it does that of other states. However, we cannot do anything here before the development [formirovaniye] of the SDI has been finished. Nevertheless, we do have to reach agreement to ensure that it does not become a reality.

[Zubkov] Vitaliy Iosifovich, to prevent this from becoming a reality there is a mass of questions about whether or not it is possible to have cooperation and joint efforts by scientists throughout the whole world to counter the SDI -- the creation, say, of laboratories, I don't know, collective laboratories in oppostion to these efforts.

[Goldanskiy] I think that I've got less than 1 minute left...

[Zubkov, interrupting] Perhaps they won't be too hard on us if you take just a tiny bit more.

[Goldanskiy] All right. We have also had a lot of questions about attitudes of scientists in general to the SDI. I wanted to stress that unlike the population of the United States as a whole, a majority of U.S. scientists are opposed to the SDI. That is the main group. A comparatively small group of apologists for SDI -- sometimes these are the authors of plans, and sometimes motives of ambition can play a part here -- sometimes they are those who feed from the SDI table. There is an interesting third group consisting of those who are engaged in deception, those who pull the wool over the eyes of the Pentagon, making out that they are working for the SDI and they, too, so to speak, try to get some money out of this business.

[Zubkov] Do you have an example of that?

[Goldanskiy] I am not going to give specific examples here but those are the impressions I have without a doubt. As far as the main point is concerned, as a rule, the opponents of the SDI are moved by considerations of principles, while those who support it act from considerations of their own personal interests in one way or another, whether they be financial, ambition, or so on. Particularly important here, moreover, is the opinion of the computer equipment specialists. I'll give you one figure: They compare the SDI program with the task of putting together a library of 5,000 books, each of 300 pages, without a single misprint, and this done without any proofreading in the manufacture of these books. That shows how great is the danger of any mistake here. As far as the international scientific community is concerned, the Pugwash Movement is one example of international opposition to nuclear war and opposition to SDI. Without any doubt there are great opportunities for cooperation, and as we know our country has proposed this, including cooperation in space, cooperation in peaceful thermonuclear uses, in the use of thermonuclear energy for peaceful purposes. If this were done, if we are talking about shortwave lasers and X-ray lasers, for example, then we should be thinking about pumping them not by nuclear explosion but by other means. On this basis, say, we should think of developing molecular holography and learning how to see the molecule in three dimensions, as it looks in reality. One can undoubtedly give many examples in high-energy physics, in astrophysics, and in neutrino-astronomy where international scientific cooperation is perfectly possible in substitution of military goals and in opposition to military goals.

[Zubkov] Well, let us, with this wish, conclude our broadcast. Let us say a big thank you to the television viewers for the numerous questions. It turned out that there were several hundred of them and we will try -- I hope you will not mind -- with the aid of the participants in the broadcast and by ourselves to try and reply to your questions, all of them, both in writing and, possibly, in subsequent broadcasts devoted to this important problem, in the subsequent "Repercussions" broadcasts.

Thank you. Thank you for taking part in the broadcast. All the best.

ISRAELYAN HOPEFUL OF CW AGREEMENT IN 1987

LD181132 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Report by Switzerland correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev]

[Text] In the Palace of Nations in Geneva the latest round of the multilateral talks on banning chemical weapons went on for almost a month within the framework of the disarmament conference. Our correspondent in Switzerland, Vladimir Dmitriyev, reports:

[Dmitriyev] Questions associated with concluding an international convention on banning these weapons and eliminating existing stocks of them were at the center of attention of those participating in the talks. The Soviet Union favors the rapid and complete elimination of chemical weapons and the actual industrial bases for manufacturing them. Indeed, it is thanks to the constructive position of the Soviet side that further progress on a number of clauses in a draft international convention was ensured here. The results of the latest round are the subject of comment by the head of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Israelyan:

[Begin Israelyan recording] The Soviet delegation introduced new proposals concerning a number of key problems in the future convention, in particular on banning the manufacture of chemical weapons in the commercial and civil chemical industry, as well as on one of the most acute questions, that is on carrying out on-site verification [proverki] on demand.

In order to ease the talks the Soviet Union accepted as a basis the proposal of the United Kingdom, which is evidence of our flexibility and our desire to conclude the talks as soon as possible.

On the whole the talks, it seems to me, provide a basis for expressing the hope that if there are no negative circumstances, and if the remaining participants in the talks display the same kind of will and interest in concluding a convention on chemical weapons, then it can actually become a reality in 1987 and an important measure for ridding our planet of weapons of mass destruction, one of which is chemical weaponry. [end recording]

SHISHLIN REVIEWS EVENTS, HAPPENINGS IN 1986

LD211920 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1310 GMT 21 Dec 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Not many days remain of 1986. Of course we are all preoccupied with today's affairs; but still, in thought, we try to sum up the departing year. And of course we ask the questions: What has the year been like, and what legacy will it pass on to the coming year? Seemingly simple questions, yet not so easy to answer. We have to take into account the sum total of the facts, phenomena and events in which this year -- proclaimed by the United Nations as International Peace Year -- has been so rich.

On this December evening, it may be appropriate to recall how the year began. It began with silence at the Soviet test sites. And as early as 15 January came the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev unveiling the major Soviet proposals for an abolition by stages of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Then in February, the 27th CPSU Congress elaborated the foundations on which a comprehensive international security system could be built. And, incidentally, the main elements of the Soviet ideas have met with understanding and support at the latest session of the UN General Assembly.

The Soviet Union played an active part last year -- or rather, in the year now ending -- in drawing up proposals for reducing conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe, for instance, in the zone stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. And though those proposals are dated summer, 1986, and we are now in December, we have yet to receive a clear answer to them from the NATO countries.

The year has, indeed, been rich in Soviet initiatives; and it has been the year of Reykjavik. That must not be forgotten. And it was Reykjavik that revealed the possibility of a breakthrough to historic accords between the Soviet Union and the United States on the problem of our time: The problem of limiting and curtailing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race. But in those days and hours of October, doubts were already creeping in as to whether the United States was willing to strike a historic compromise. The reason for the doubts was that the United States did not submit any proposals of its own at Reykjavik: All it did was react to the Soviet proposals. And as the days and weeks that followed were to show, those doubts proved well-founded. And it is not just a question of the United States' blind adherence to SDI -- the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is also a matter of such actions as the U.S. withdrawal from SALT II, U.S. actions in regional conflicts, and the latest outbreak of anti-Soviet rhetoric, which remains harmful even though it is something we have had to get used to.

And yet we should not be in a hurry to say that 1986 has been a barren year with regard to the creation of healthier international relations, or from the viewpoint of strengthening the foundations of universal peace.

Here, we should not be hasty. No. It is true, of course, that the world's armaments have not been reduced by even a single item. It is true, too, that the hotbeds of tension on the planet are still at boiling point; civil war rages in Lebanon; the Iran-Iraq war is being stoked by Washington, as has been shown clearly enough by the latest big scandal there, which revealed plainly that the United States is supplying arms both to Tehran and to Baghdad. Unrest continues in Central America and in southern Africa. All that is true. And of course, we must bear in mind that the possibliity of achieving a historic decision to stop nuclear tests was very close -- only half a step away. But the way things are going, it looks as if the United States is, by their actions, cancelling that possibility, too. And this has been said, openly, honestly and in good time, in the Soviet Government statement. Now, a great deal -- a great deal -- will depend on the position of the United States: Whether we shall succeed in making the unilateral Soviet moratorium into a bilateral, Soviet-U.S. moratorium, or whether, in the interests of its own national security, the Soviet Union will have to resume testing.

However, in speaking of these dramatic pictures and dramatic situations of 1986, we must nonetheless see that, of course, all these initiatives, all these actions by the Soviet Union that we have mentioned, have of course augmented the potential for peace, added to the credit balance of peace; and along with the efforts of the other peaceloving states, they do, of course, make up the most important legacy of the old year to the new. And of course, the steps and the actions that have been taken by various political and public circles to make today's world a better world and a calmer world, have not been fruitless and have not been impotent. And perhaps the most important and most valuable thing from this viewpoint is the change in public attitudes that is beginning to take shape under the influence of the actions by the Soviet Union and by the other socialist countries, and by peace-loving social forces. And, you know, it is a very difficult thing to get through to the public consciousness in the capitalist countries, especially in the United States, where a powerful system operates to brainwash public opinion in favor of the tendencies by which the activities of the administration are dominated. Yet in this respect, 1986 has seen some changes -- precious changes.

DELEGATION HEAD KASHLEV SPEAKS AT CSCE MEETING

LD191648 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 19 Dec 86

["Statement by the Head of the Soviet Delegation at the Vienna Meeting" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Vienna, 19 Dec TASS -- The concluding session of the first stage of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe took place here today.

In his statement, the head of the USSR delegation, Ambassador Yu.B. Kashlev, noted that in the period after the Madrid meeting, as the discussion has shown, two tendencies in the approach of the participating countries to the problems of security in Europe and in the world as a whole were clearly revealed. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries embodied one tendency. Its landmarks were the program put forward in the statement on 15 January of this year on eliminating nuclear and other forms of mass annihilation weapons by the end of the present century; the bold and cardinal proposals by the USSR in Reykjavik; the unilateral cessation of nuclear tests by the Soviet Union (silence has held sway on our test sites for 500 days already); the large-scale proposals by the Warsaw Pact states on reducing armed forces and conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals; and a number of others.

Acting in the spirit of Helsinki, the Soviet Union states its willingness to discuss the issue of nonnuclear status of the Baltic Sea area, dismantled medium-range missile launching facilities on the Kola Peninsula, and a large part of them on the territory of the relevant military districts [okrug].

In the United Nations, socialist countries put forward proposals on the creation of an all-encompassing system of international security. All this is aimed at one objective -- to ensure fundamental change in international affairs, and to achieve radical improvement of the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole.

The second approach found its expression in the U.S. adoption of the "Star Wars" program and drawing other countries into it, breaking off the accords that were outlined in Reykjavik, and fully eliminating its consequences by continuing tests of nuclear weapons, in breaking the SALT II treaty, which curbs the arms race, and in undermining the foundations of the ABM Treaty.

The U.S. policy in the Mediterranean region is seriously undermining the all-European security, too.

The draft of the document on additions to the mandate of the Stockholm conference put forward by the PPR delegation will make possible a transition to practical talks within the framework of the CSCE on cutting armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. It takes into account the profound interest which the West European countries are showing in reducing military confrontation in Europe. The NATO side has not yet undertaken serious steps in this direction.

International law issues relating to principles and humanitarian cooperation occupied a large and important place in the discussions.

The representatives of the United States -- a country that has carried out flagrant acts of direct aggression against Libya, Grenada, Nicaragua; that has trampled on the principles of the Helsinki Declaration, by which the member-states took on the obligation to be guided by not only relations with one another, but also in relations with other states of the world -- had no scruples about putting on a magistrate's robe and appearing at our meeting in the role of defenders and international law and order.

The discussion of human rights issues at the Vienna meeting, which was diverted from the problems of observation of these rights and was used only for the purposes of confrontation, leaves an oppressive impression. The way proposed by the United States delegation leads to nowhere. Our task is to enable this meeting to mark a step toward the noble goals laid down in the Final Act.

The U.S. delegation tried to continue this same confrontational line during discussion of specific issues of cooperation in humanitarian spheres.

The Soviet delegation hopes that reason, goodwill, and a general commitment to success will predominate, and that after the recess, we will together be able to engage in constructive work, the head of the Soviet delegation declared.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD212112 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 21 Dec 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program with political observers Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin and Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, dear comrades! We shall begin our program today with the December 18 statement by the Soviet Government on the nuclear test moratorium. I will not go into the history of this question; you are well aware that our country has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions four times. But we have now reached a new point at which, while the Soviet Union has not carried out any nuclear tests for more than 500 days -- today make 503 days -- the United States has carried out 20 officially announced and 4 unannounced nuclear weapons tests. Although these four tests were not announced, they were however, recorded by the relevant instruments at the disposal of our government, among others, and made public.

In this situation, after a profound and all-round study of the matter, the Soviet leadership came to the conclusion that the following steps must be taken. Let me remind you what they are. First, the Soviet Union is again proposing that full-scale talks be started without delay on the complete banning of nuclear tests. It is ready to hold such talks with any group of participants and at any forum, but naturally with the United States participating. During those talks the questions of monitoring [kontrol], among others, must be solved in such a way as to ensure that an agreement on this is properly observed.

[Bovin] Let me interrupt you here. On this point the U.S. is now maneuvering as follows: Over there they have the problem of the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The Americans are therefore suggesting the following to us: Let's get together for the sole purpose of making amendments to those treaties to improve the monitoring, then we will submit them to Congress and ratify them. However -- and now it gets interesting -- if you don't want to have talks about this, they say, we will still submit them to Congress, and we will still ratify them, but with stipulations. In other words, they are taking a deliberate step to let some of the steam, so to speak, out of public opinion. That's simply a footnote to this point.

[Levin] And it's a substantial footnote. The second point in the Soviet statement is that the USSR is ready to continue its moratorium; however, it will resume its nuclear tests after the very first nuclear explosion in the United States next year. Here it's probably appropriate to add that according to THE WASHINGTON POST, the United States is planning to carry out its first test next year on January 29, and overall in the first quarter of the year five nuclear explosions are planned. But here the situation depends wholly and completely on what stance the United States will adopt. It is appropriate to mention that literally on the very same day that the Soviet Union made the statement, 130 U.S. congressmen sent a message to President Reagan pressing him to support the Soviet position regarding the moratorium and stop nuclear tests from continuing.

[Kobysh] Allow me to make a little comment, too, on this point, and then we can go on. You said that everything would depend on the stance that the United States would adopt. Of course, we would like to believe that reason prevails and that some forces...there are various forces at work in the United States: The military industrial complex is far from being the only force; and as the magazine FORTUNE has just reported -- and this is a very interesting piece of information -- the military business world is not predominant, and what is more, they calculate that it is reducing the profits of American capitalism.

[Bovin] Well, you don't need a report from the latest magazine to tell you that!

[Kobysh] That's right, you don't. But the thing is that this is what is reported by an organ of American capitalism, and its conclusion is that the most profitable thing for American corporations would be the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether. That's something very interesting.

[Bovin] Yes, it is.

[Kobysh] However, the decision will, nevertheless, be made by the powers now standing at the helm, and they have already said that regardless of what the Soviet Union says or does, the United States will continue its nuclear tests. That goes to show that we should not hold excessive hopes, although we are counting very much on the fact that serious forces will take a serious attitude to what was said in the Soviet statement.

[Levin] And right here it is appropriate to mention the third point in the Soviet statement, which says that if the United States ends its nuclear tests, the USSR will be ready on any day of any month, on the basis of reciprocity, to halt the implementation of its test program. So this is the situation taking shape. Both the sincerity of the Soviet Union and its flexibility in approaching the problem of ending nuclear tests are confirmed not just by the Soviet Government statement, but also by the stance which was set forth in particular by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik. For, if our comrades recall, the point made there was that we were ready to agree to some sort of scheme, some sort of plan, being developed for a certain number of nuclear tests being carried out, but on condition that talks be started without delay on signing an agreement for the complete banning of such tests.

[Bovin] We had quite a flexible position which contained the provision for a whole number of different versions so as to make it easier for the United States to make some sort of sensible decision. But all the same, they kept to this hard-headedness of theirs, saying no and that's that...

[Levin] And it wasn't at Reykjavik that this hard-headedness started. Almost a year ago, on January 15, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made a statement setting forth a stage-by-stage plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons over the next 15 years, and a great deal of attention was paid in that statement in particular to the problem of ending nuclear explosions. Also in that statement, almost a year ago it was stressed that it was essential to resume as soon as possible the trilateral talks between the USSR, the United States, and Britain on the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapons tests. That could have been done immediately -- that very month. That was what Mikhail Sergeyevich said last January 15. They are avoiding talks, and they are avoiding embarking on the path of completely banning nuclear tests.

[Bovin] It is what could be called the potential of lost opportunities. And after all, just look at how many lost opportunities there have been to change the course of history, to move away from the arms race -- first one opportunity, then two, then three...

[Kobysh] Yes, the United States now, the administration, the ruling class, are bearing the enormous political costs of flatly and blindly refusing to join our moratorium. It is evoking a response throughout the world, even in the United States. And why? It is because SDI and basically all these tests are oriented toward experiments and practical work connected with the nuclear triggering of lasers, X-ray lasers. That is the aim of the tests that are now being carried out.

[Levin] And speaking of lost opportunities, it is not only the Soviet Union which advocates the ending of nuclear tests. The Delhi Six are also actively campaigning for this, and the subject was very vividly reflected in the Delhi declaration signed during the visit to India by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Finally there was a very recent event -- the accession by the Soviet Union to the Rarotonga Treaty, the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. This treaty was approved on 6 August 1985, the same day, incidentally, that the Soviet moratorium started, but also a day that has meaning for all of us for another reason. August 6 was the day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima; a reminder, so to speak, of the catastrophic consequences that using nuclear weapons can and has already led to. And so the Soviet Union was the first among the nuclear powers to acceed to this treaty, and it pledged to respect the status of the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. But what they are saying in the West -- in particular the French newspaper LE MONDE, although its attitude is understandable because it is in that very area, the Muroroa Atoll, that the French carry out their nuclear tests -- what they are saying is that it is not in the interests of the West. Here there arises what I would call a very delicate question: What exactly is in the interests of the West? Nuclear explosions being carried out all over the world? Strong-arm pressure on all countries?

[Kobysh] Viktor Nikolayevich, when you were recounting the forces advocating the ending of tests, perhaps it would be worth mentioning the very important, the extraordinarily important position of China.

[Levin] Of course.

[Kobysh] This is of enormous significance, because China is a great power -- it is a nuclear power -- and the very fact that given a definite accord, it agrees to both the ending of tests and to the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether, qualitatively changes the situation. France and Britain will then also be in the same position. And there is one further question, another aspect: According to the calculations of scientists, including U.S. scientists, by the end of this century, about 10, and some even say 11 countries, will possess nuclear weapons...

[Levin, interrupting] Some of them, it seems, already possess them.

[Kobysh] Some, yes...

[Bovin] First of all, don't frighten people...

[Kobysh] I am not frightening people; I am just saying that the problem is acquiring a very acute, a very urgent nature. And great dialectics are at work here, because the present U.S. Administration opposes tests and yet it has so far been unwilling to reach agreement on the prohibition and on the elimination of nuclear weapons. At the same time, it is in complete solidarity with us on the point that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a threat for the whole of humanity and that it is a terrible thing. Our positions on this completely coincide. And at all the talks on this issue we have identical documents.

[Bovin] And it is exactly this which is the contradiction in the U.S. position...

[Kobysh] Of course...

[Bovin] ...Because it is impossible on the one hand to oppose proliferation, and on the other to pursue the arms race, which promotes the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And of course this duality of the U.S. position, it...

[Kobysh] It does not add up.

[Bovin] Yes, that is it. Yes, it shows.

[Levin] Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich, you have used the term, the duality of the U.S. position. But surely this duality -- though perhaps this would be the mildest description of the case in question -- is very characteristic of that position which the U.S. Administration adopted in the Iran-Iraq conflict. I have in mind not only Irangate but everything connected with this.

[Bovin] By the way, you used the word Irangate. Now on this, I would like to say the following: I understand that as a journalistic metaphor we freely use Irangate -- all that is clear -- but, we ourselves should understand that the analogy with Watergate is really a very nominal one. After all, what was Watergate? Nixon used power for his own self-seeking interests...

[Levin] Political interests...

[Bovin] Yes, well, for his own personal interests. He abused his power. Reagan has abused his power not for his own interests but in the interests of the United States, naturally, as he understands them.

That is one aspect which distinguishes Watergate from that which we call Irangate. And the second is that if Nixon had succeeded in proving that he did not know about the thing called Watergate, he would of course have been saved. But now, if Reagan did not know what was going on under his own nose, this, by contrast, is an indictment of Reagan.

Therefore, I think that these analogies may sometimes have an expressive ring to them, but all the same let us distinguish these different things.

[Kobysh] Let us make the distinction, but here I am not completely in agreement with you in this respect. I think that Watergate, in essence, was a kindergarten by comparison with Irangate.

[Bovin] Well, all the more so, then. Of course this is a great hypocrisy.

[Kobysh] But in principle, after all, this hypocrisy is not linked only with Irangate or Watergate. For example, the Nicaraguan National Assembly, following the intercession of the president of Nicaragua, has just demonstrated great magnanimity and freed a U.S. military advisor who had been directly controlling actions by the contras and had been taken prisoner. He had been given a 30-year sentence, yet he was released. And he has already flown off with some senator who was in Managua. But here is a report which I will read out for you about another American by the name of Hall...

[Bovin] Yes, again he was recently caught...

[Kobysh] Hall was involved in organizing a plot aimed at murdering, in 1985, the U.S. ambassador in Costa Rica -- I repeat, the U.S. ambassador in Costa Rica.

Of course the CIA was behind this, and perhaps the Pentagon, subsequently accusing the Sandinist government of this crime.... Now how can there be talk about morality here, about Watergate, about Irangate, when they are ready to murder their own ambassador for the sake of later achieving some kind of political aims or gains?

[Levin] Well, so far as Irangate is concerned, of course, there are very many aspects here, but a great impression was made on me by the exposure of the fact that it turns out that the United States supplied weapons to Iran, and secret data on the movements of Iranian troops to Iraq -- the other combatant in this conflict!

[Bovin] Well, you know, this does not surprise me in the slightest. Because from the U.S. viewpoint there is no gain in Iran winning. And there is no gain in Iraq winning, so that is how you have the position arising. It is amoral, call it what you like, but it stems from purely pragmatic interests so to speak. And here, this does not surprise me.

[Kobysh] This is geopolitics.

[Bovin] It is, yes; it is pure realpolitik, as the Germans used to say. Yes, it has nothing to do with morality.

[Kobysh] It is cynical ... and what do ordinary Americans feel? Over the past few years they have been conditioned against Iran; they have been told that these are evil people. That these are some kind of semihumans. And it turns out that talks have been held with them, that they were supplied with money and weapons.

[Bovin] And here, up bobs another more general problem -- that is the competence, for example, of Reagan and his team. After all, it is no coincidence that the U.S. press is saying that competence is the Achille's heel of the Presidency. That is, there are no people in his entourage, at the center, no real analysts who are able to clearly see what isgoing on. After all, Reagan has clearly gained a distorted picture of what is going on in Tehran. He was unable to correctly understand the correlation of forces and simply used the Israeli pattern as a guide, instead of analyzing the situation and finding out what is going on. And so, you see, this Irangate, as we call it, is now developing into criticism of Reagan's foreign policy as a whole and of the methods of conducting policy. Now that is interesting. It is not a single occurrence. It is not just some kind of individual item. It is a crisis in Reagan's foreign policy, and it is now absolutely apparent.

However, Reagan is an awfully lucky person. [chuckles] He has always had good luck...

[Kobysh] Apart from what has been going on recently...

[Bovin] Yes, there you are, there you are...and he has always somehow been able to extricate himself out of everything which happens. What about the Marines they killed in Beirut? He just brushed himself off and went on, and nothing came of it. He went to Bitburg, to that cemetery in the FRG and what a row there was over it! But the same thing happened -- he brushed himself off and went on. But now it is not passing over. He is not getting over this. I have even noticed how limply he is bearing himself. You know, that self-assurance which has been characteristic of him at press conferences -- it's gone. He's a sort of hesitant and troubled person, as if he doesn't know what to say. And this, is my mind is of substantial importance. It has to be compared with the results of the last elections. After all, what did the elections to Congress show? That public opinion is moving toward the right of center [phrase as heard] on the political spectrum. And it is against such an internal backdrop that this particular scandal has flared up.

This means that the criticism of Reagan is not merely temporary and related to the events in question. It means that despite all his popularity in the country, some kind of turn in public opinion is taking place. And it seems to me that this is very important, and it is very necessary to follow this because here perhaps some kind of prospects of a change in U.S. policy are opening up. And when I hear sometimes that what is happening now with Reagan is that the rightwingers, ultra-right, and the military-industrial complex want to punish him for Reykjavik, I cannot take that attitude seriously. Because the same military-industrial complex and those same ultra-rightwingers understand full well Reagan's true position, and they not only do not want to ruin him now; on the contrary, they are seeking to save him from this criticism.

[Kobysh] They cannot permit a second Watergate and a second impeachment.

[Bovin] Yes, yes, yes, to save him, to drag him out of this.

[Kobysh] I want to stress another two issues in this connection, because this goes beyond the bounds of Irangate and Reagan as such. It seems to me that what has now happened is in fact logical. I am a little surprised, having been involved with the United States for quite a long time, and following what goes on there in a fairly attentive way -- I am surprised that all this did not happen sooner. Because, on the whole, as Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich said, policy has been developed by unqualified people. And there are more than enough qualified people in the United States. But the California Mafia clawed its way to power. The advertising business, if you like, which manufactured popularity for Reagan clawed its way to power. They are brilliantly capable of producing a television broadcast, but they are unable to make a profound international analysis.

[Kobysh] And what has happened now is logical, and it is not the first time it has happened, though before it was simply glossed over. There will be more of this in the future. This is the first point. And the second, If you don't mind, I will sympathize a little with Reagan, however strange it may sound...

[Bovin] So why not?

[Levin] We are sharing the sympathy, you know. [giggles]

[Kobysh] The United States is a cruel country, cruel in the foundations it is built on, in its morals, its ethics. When a man is all right, when he is popular, when he is strong, he gains even more in strength and everybody shouts hurrah to him. But as soon as something slightly goes wrong with him, something goes out of order, everybody abandons him and he starts to sink. We remember how it was with Nixon, and we can see it happening now to Reagan. I have learned of a horrible thing and even talking about it makes one sick, yet I am thinking of Reagan now as just a human being. He is 76, and it is clear that whatever health he enjoys, he has problems. He needs an operation, the same kind of operation that was performed on him 20 years ago. And here is what has been reported in connection with this: On 4 January he is to be taken to hospital for some days. In connection with this, the CBS television company reports the President's health problems and his stay in a hospital at the peak of the scandal with the arms supplies to Iran and the channelling of the money to the Nicaraguan contras, all this -- and what is particularly interesting, this is what the President's closest supporters think -- will have an adverse effect on Reagan's political image. In other words, you must not fall sick; you are not allowed to be weak, and it is forbidden to go into hospital. What kind of society is that? What people are they? How can one do things like that?

[Bovin] You are right, of course, and, indeed, the President may have a wart or a pimple or something else but it is all under a magnifying glass -- by the press and television -- so there is really no place one could hide from this. Now you see the cruelty of this political intrigue.

[Levin] Having finished with this subject, I would like to dwell on yet another event of the last week which has evoked great interest. I mean the Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV]. The congress was very interesting in many respects. It has unmasked shortcomings very boldly and faced up to the truth. As the head of the CPSU delegation to the Vietnamese Communist Congress, Comrade Ligachev, pointed out, this was a lesson of truth. The Vietnamese comrades very sharply disclosed the problems that they are encountering; they were saying that they had failed to provide full employment and that it has not been possible to stabilize the standard of living of working people. Yet they were pointing to ways toward solving those problems. This is a very important point. And, on the whole, one can safely say that the Sixth CPV Congress was in the mainstream of those congresses of fraternal parties that took place this year, starting with the 27th CPSU Congress -- the spirit of principled criticism and creative spirit was reigning there.

[Kobysh] The whole world has paid perhaps particular attention to two points in the speech by Comrade Ligachev. The first point: We will be strengthening along all lines our cooperation, first of all, economic cooperation which Vietnam needs; and, second, we will adhere to the position of a deep respect for Vietnam's independence and for its pursuing its own policy.

[Bovin] Well, our time is nearly up. As you see, there are many events occupying many different planes, but we are trying to discuss the main things, among which is the congress in Hanoi and various other problems; yet there is another problem worth mentioning, too. This is the Contadora Group, the latest meeting of which took place in Latin America. I think that was significant, too, comrades.

[Kobysh] It was very significant. The meeting of the foreign ministers of the member countries of the Contadora Group took place in Rio de Janeiro and....

[Bovin, interrupting] I think it was the first time that they met, so to speak....

[Kobysh, interrupting] It was for the first time that they met at such a high level....

[Bovin, interrupting] And in such a big country.

[Kobysh] In such a big country, and overall in such a substantial group. Both the situation in Central America and a number of issues concerning Latin America in general, including Latin American integration, were examined at that meeting. This is what I think is the most interesting: that the mounting interference of the United States in the Central American crisis and the growing military and financial aid to the Nicaraguan contras from Washington is causing a deep concern in all the participants in the conference. This was stated by none other than Brazilian Foreign Minister Sodre at the news conference immediately after the meeting ended.

[Bovin] I recall that Nixon once said that Latin America would go whichever way Brazil would go. Well, maybe it is not quite exactly true, so to speak, but there is some sense in this.

And right now Brazil is taking Latin America somewhat away from the United States, so to speak.

[Kobysh] Sodre said it straight: We think that the United States must immediately stop supporting the anti-Sandinist elements because it leads to the lengthening of the conflict and hampers the establishment of a stable peace in the region. You know, Brazil's voice in this case is very important and maybe in the context of everything we have been discussing -- Irangate, and....

[Levin, interrupting] The U.S. attitude to the moratorium....

[Kobysh, interrupting] And the U.S. attitude to the moratorium, and the attitude and the aid from the CIA and the Pentagon to the contras, has shown that there are very deep disagreements within the administration itself. And a recent report says U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has officially forbidden all American ambassadors to bypass him or to maintain private links with the President's national security advisor -- it is Carlucci now -- except in those cases when such a clearly defined order is given by the President himself. This report is of no small interest.

[Bovin] Amusing.

[Kobysh] Amusing, indeed. In a telegram sent by Secretary of State Shultz to all American ambassadors abroad, it is said -- this is written in THE NEW YORK TIMES, and this is a serious newspaper, you know -- that links of this kind with Carlucci, without previously advising the secretary of state or without Reagan's personal instructions, will be regarded as a violation of the rules governing activities of ambassadors. In other words, the CIA, the Pentagon....

[Bovin, interrupting] Yes, Shultz does not want to be bypassed; he wants to govern his department himself.

[Kobysh, continuing] ...they will have to act in somewhat more complicated conditions now. If one keeps in mind that at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow now there is a dilemma over who should be finally sent back considering the strict quota, the Americans themselves say that the distibution is as follows: Half are diplomats and the other half are intelligence officers from the CIA and the Pentagon, and the ambassador and State Department are inclined to send some back so that service staff can be brought over.

[Bovin] So they are substituting cooks for intelligence officers!

[Kobysh] Yes, cooks! The CIA does not want it, but, it seems, the apportionment of forces is such at the moment that the decision is not the CIA's to make. This is an interesting feature of the current situation in the United States.

[Levin] And, to my way of thinking, a feature that gives certain grounds for optimism. Yet, as the subject is a delicate one, we will put a full stop here and will see what happens next! Thank you, dear comrades; all the best to you.

PEACE GROUPS SEND LETTER TO REAGAN

LD230923 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 23 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 23 TASS -- The participants in a plenary meeting of the Soviet Peace Committee and the board of the Soviet Peace Fund, which took place in Moscow today, appealed to the U.S. President "to display goodwill and political responsibility." Speaking on behalf of millions of Soviet peace campaigners, they demanded in a letter to Ronald Reagan an end to nuclear testing. A delegation chosen by the plenary meeting, led by writer Anatoliy Ananiyev, a deputy chairman of the Peace Committee, called at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and handed the letter to an Embassy official.

Just a few days separate us from December 31, when the Soviet unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions runs out, the letter says. You know perfectly well that this moratorium, announced by the USSR on August 6, 1985, has been extended four times. The Soviet leadership did so fulfilling the will of the Soviet people and meeting the numerous requests from the world's peaceloving public, including the Americans.

All this time we, like millions of people all over the world, have been hoping that your adminstration will give a positive response to this important Soviet initiative and renounce nuclear testing. However, these hopes have not yet come true.

The participants in the plenary meeting recall that the Soviet Government suggested in its statement of December 18 immediate full-scale talks on a total nuclear test ban and expressed its readiness to continue to respect its moratorium till the first U.S. nuclear explosion next year.

The Soviet peace campaigners urge the U.S. President: Use the chance which still is open and do at long last what the peoples of all the countries and continents, including the Americans, are demanding so strongly and unanimously -- stop nuclear weapons test.

RUMORS OF FURTHER NUCLEAR TEST 'PROVOCATIVE'

LD230024 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by political observer Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Hello, comrades! At present there is a particularly deep division between those in America who are in favor of the Republican administration immediately joining the Soviet moratorium, while it is not yet too late, and those who insist in every possible way that nuclear tests at the Nevada test ground continue. While the first point of view is expressed by a considerable majority of the American public, including influencial circles in the Congress, there are also -- although in a minority, but obviously having a decisive influence in the present adminstration -- which insist that nuclear tests continue. These are, above all, U.S. military-industrial corporations which hold the main levers of power in Reagan's Washington. Such a situation will, as far as can be judged at present, lead to Washington definitely missing the invaluable opportunity offered by the Soviet moratorium.

It is not coincidental that in reply to the Soviet Government warning that it cannot threaten the security of its country and that it will be forced to announce the end of the moratorium after the next new U.S. test, provocative rumors leaked from high Washington offices that the new test will be carried out next month. So have all our efforts -- and let us say it directly, sacrifices -- been in vain? Can such a question arise! Far from it. I will not speak about that which has been said many times -- the enormous moral effect of our moratorium -- which in essence has buried the hostile myth of a Soviet military threat, but I will recall something else, the influence of the constructive peace-loving policy of Moscow on the political climate in the world, including that in the United States.

The present -- the biggest in the last 10 years -- internal political scandal in Washington, known as "Irangate," has assumed its scale and depth not lastly because it also exposed the uncontrolled -- not only operating behind the back of the electorate but also the Congress and a greater part of the government -- group of representatives from circles closest to the President. This group of people appointed arbitrarily by the President, (?calling) itself the National Security Council, has been steering the U.S. political course in recent years not only contrary to the interests of the majority of the American people, but also a considerable part of business circles, exclusively in the name of profits of the most aggressive part of the monopolies -- military-industrial complex. These monopolies have been setting the tune of the Washington's policy in recent years. The scandal, which has exposed gross violence in the activities of various business circles and U.S. Government bodies, is fraught with far-reaching consequences. Public circles and influential business groups now demand the liquidation of the dictatorship of the Californian military-industrial mafia. The rejection of the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests will put before the present Washington leadership new difficult political tasks which will not be as easily brushed aside as it perhaps seems to some today.

PENTAGON TO EXPLOIT SPACE STATION FOR SDI

LD210317 Moscow TASS in English 2217 GMT 20 Dec 86

[Text] Washington December 20 TASS -- The Pentagon has made a decision in accordance with which the project of the construction of a U.S. orbital scientific space station will from now on be subjugated to aims and goals of the "Star Wars" program. THE WASHINGTON POST reports this with a reference to informed representatives of the Department of Defense.

This decision means that the orbital station being developed now will actually not be used for peaceful exploration of outer space. This decision also indicates that the United States unilaterally broke its obligations to a number of allied countries earlier invited to take part in the project. The talks on cooperation in the sphere of the construction and uses of the station had been conducted among the United States, the European Space Agency, Japan and Canada.

On the insistence of the Department of Defense these consultations had been put off "indefinitely." The newspaper writes that the U.S. military circles do not want even the United States' closest allies to get an access to the latest technology developed in the framework of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

New York December 20 TASS -- THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR learned that the Strategic Defense Initiative organization had turned over to the Energy Applications and Systems Corporation 90 thousand dollars to develop an anti-missile space gun. The design envisages the use of the energy of nuclear explosion to speed up the flight of shells in outer space. The gun is planned to be deployed on combat orbital stations being created under the "Star Wars" program.

The newspaper writes that the space services corporation simultaneously embarks on the development of a spy radar space system which, according to the designs of the Pentagon strategists, should enhance the United States potentials in collecting information on the location of the land-based Soviet ballistic nuclear missiles. It is hoped in Washington that such information would help implement the intentions of U. S. militarists to deal a first nuclear strike.

The adventuristic character of the "Star Wars" program causes the growing concern in international circles of scientists. "It is a widely held view in the scientific community that countermeasures will be easier to do than developing the defense," Kurt Gottfried, a Cornell University physicist, writes in THE NEW YORK TIMES.

London December 20 TASS -- Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative" pursues offensive, not defensive, aims and leads to a considerable escalation of the arms race. Prominent British specialist in electronic equipment Richard Annals writes this in the book titled "Star Wars: A Question of Initiative".

The author stresses SDI is based on the idea that the United States will simultaneously ensure its security and get an opportunity to attack enemy by means of contemporary technology. The scientist is of the opinion that the implementation of the SDI program leads to the breach of the ABM Treaty, undermines the entire structure of international agreements in the sphere of arms control.

PENTAGON SAID PURSUING CBW RESEARCH IN LAHORE

LD141310 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 13 Dec 86

[Text] The U.S. Defense Department this year allocated $42 million on research and development for various types of bacteriological weaponry. The corporation Mark Collett is to carry out research and development into a deadly virus of the rare and quick-acting Rift Valley fever. The Pentagon's secret bacteriological center in Fort Detrick is particularly notorious, whose laboratories are responsible for the leakage of the virus causing the incurable disease AIDS, with this giving rise to a sharp outbreak of the disease among the Americans, and it was observed, among residents in other countries who live close to the Pentagon bases there.

The U.S. centers who specialize in developing bacteriological weaponry are spread though the world. One of these is sited in the Pakistani city of Lahore where, under a veil of combatting malaria, American experts on assignments from the CIA and the Pentagon conduct research on developing new types of bacteriological weaponry, including those causing grave mental disorders. Local residents meanwhile are being used as guinea pigs by researchers at the Lahore center, with over 500 residents of Lahore who suffer from yellow fever, jaundice and mental disorders falling victim to criminal experiments.

The Indian weekly BLITZ reports since 1980 Lahore has become the center for breeding particularly dangerous species of mosquitoes to be used against the population in Afghanistan. Attempts at using these to cause an outbreak of encephalitis among Afghan and Pakistani nomadic tribes have been made public. The outbreak of a hitherto unknown epidemic was registered over a year ago in the Indian State Rajasthan. The Indian bacteriologists arrived at the conclusion that virus-infected mosquitoes were the specific carriers of the infection. Experts believe these insects had been prepared at the bacteriological center in Lahore.

The Pentagon continues research on developing new types of bacteriological weaponry despite the fact that the existing stockpiles are ample enough to kill humanity dozens of times over. U.S. military cynically describes the bacteriological weaponry as the weaponry of the future and believes it to be among the most cost-paying since, in their estimate, its production cost in quantities sufficient to kill one individual is 30-40 times less than that of same amount of other weapons.

U.S. NAVY TO BUILD FACILITY ON ALEUTIAN ISLAND

LD220741 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] San Francisco December 22 TASS -- The U.S. Navy has announced Amchitka, one of the islands of the Aleutian archipelago, to be a restricted zone in connection with the construction there of a top secret military facility. Fishing vessels, which usually found shelter in the bay of the island in stormy weather, and Aleutians, who regularly came there to worship at the tombs of the ancestors, are now prohibited to visit the island. Also barred from the island will be nature lovers coming to the national preserve in Amchitka. The UPI agency said that according to a naval project, it is planned to install radars of the latest type on the island.

BRIEFS

SABIN ELECTED TO ACADEMY -- Moscow December 11 TASS -- Well-known U.S. scientist Albert Sabin was elected a foreign member of the Soviet Academy of Medical Sciences. This was announced at a session of the academy's general assembly today. The honorary title is one more proof of Soviet scientists' respect for the virologist of world renown who developed a poliomyelitic vaccine. He is an honorary member of the All-Union Scientific Society of Microbiologists, Epidemiologists and Parasitologists named after Iliya Mechnikov. Recently, ahead of his 80th birthday, Albert Sabin was awarded with the Soviet People's Friendship Order. His contacts with colleagues from the USSR have been developed through cooperation of many years. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2210 GMT 11 Dec 86 LD]

STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS IN SHANGHAI, HEFEI NOTED

Call For 'Democracy'

LD222213 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] The CHINA DAILY newspaper reports that a representative of the PRC State Education Commission has announced that students from some higher educational institutions in Hefei and Shanghai held demonstrations recently. The demonstrators put forward demands in pamphlets and slogans calling for an improvement in the life of the student population, including teaching and service in student dining halls. The XINHUA NEWS AGENCY reports in a bulletin from Shanghai that since 19 December thousands of students from higher educational institutions have held rallies and demonstrations in the city center, bearing placards with the slogan: We Want Democracy. According to the agency report, the students' representatives were received by Jiang Zemin, mayor of Shanghai, who exhorted them to return to their institutes to continue normal studies.

No Punishment for Students

OW221059 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] According to a foreign news agency's report, China's university students held the second mass demonstration in Shanghai on Saturday. Thirty thousand people took to the streets in this largest industrial center of China. They called for democratic reform in China. The demonstration was peacefully staged and well organized.

On 19 December 10,000 people staged the first demonstration in Shanghai. Some demonstrators waited in front of the Shanghai Municipal Government building throughout the night of 19-20 December.

The XINHUA NEWS AGENCY transmitted a statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Education. He said: The Chinese Government supports democracy. The dmonstrators will not be punished because they have taken action within the scope of the law.

Clash With Police Reported

OW231205 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 23 Dec 86

[Text] The Shanghai television station reported on student demonstrations in the municipality for the first time on 22 December. The student demonstrators demanded democratic reforms in China. Tens of thousands of students took part in the demonstrations.

The Shanghai television station pointed out: It is understandable that the overwhelming majority of students wishes for democratization at an early date. Regrettably, some students have misunderstood the current domestic reforms.

The Shanghai student demonstrations lasted 3 days. The Shanghai press has reported that students clashed with police during the demonstrations. Student demonstrations also took place in other Chinese cities this month.

VOSS INTERVIEWED ON JAPAN ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE

PM221357 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 5

["IZVESTIYA Interview" with A.E. Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by A. Shalnev: "A.E. Voss: We Have Begun To Understand Each Other Better" -- first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] The general opinion was that the conference had been successful and had made it possible not only to gain a better understanding of each other's viewpoint but also to identify similar positins and determine new ways to ensure the further rapprochement of views on the questions under discussion.

But the central issues at the conference -- the Fifth Soviet and Japanese Public "Roundtable" Conference -- were those of war and peace. And although the subject of this forum, held recently in Tokyo, was formulated as "The Role of the USSR and Japanese Public Ensuring Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific Region," the discussion was about the fate of the planet as a whole. The Soviet delegation was headed by A.E. Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Today's IZVESTIYA interview is with him.

[Shalnev] Avgust Eduardovich, this was the fifth such forum. How was it distinguished from the previous ones?

[Voss] It was distinguished by the broad range of people represented. On the Japanese side, five large organizations were the initiators and enlisted approximately 400 people to take part in the meeting; including a large group of parliamentary deputies not only from opposition parties but also from the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party, representatives of scientific, business, and religious circles, education and press workers, and people from the worlds of art and sport. Thirty different organizations were represented on our side, including organizations from Leningrad, Kiev, the Baltic republics, Siberia, and the Far East. The level at which we were received was high -- we had meetings with the prime minister, the foreign minister, the chairman of both chambers of parliament, and the leaders of the main parties.

[Shalnev] Was this in addition to the meetings actually held as part of the conference?

[Voss] Yes. In other words, we had the opportunity to expound in detail our viewpoint on the most topical problems of the international situation. We were particularly persistent in stressing the point that the present alarming situation in the world requires increased effective efforts and collective actions by all countries and peoples -- including those in the Asia-Pacific region -- aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons, preventing the militarization of space, and ending nuclear tests.

The conversations and discussions both at the conference itself and behind the scenes were frank -- mutual understanding is impossible without frankness -- and we plainly said that the Soviet public is really very concerned at official Tokyo's position on SDI. Participation in implementing the "Star Wars" program, we stressed, could, in our opinion, lead to destabilization in the strategic military sphere on a global level and in the Asia-Pacific region in particular, and could also give rise to unsubstantiated but dangerous calculations among those who favor solving problems by force.

[Shalnev] What did the Japanese side have to say on this score?

[Voss] Many said that the "Star Wars" program has aggravated the situation in the world and has become a factor of tension. At the same time, the idea was heard in several speeches that SDI is useful because it may be a spur to the development of science and technology. We did not keep count, of course, of the number of times this was said, but one cannot fail to notice that the unanimously adopted conference communique notes the need to "mobilize international public opinion for the sake of ending the nuclear arms race and using space exclusively for peaceful purposes."

[Shalnev] The communique highly appraises the "possibility of reaching a principled accord on nuclear disarmament issues that emerged during the talks in Reykjavik."

[Voss] This was a key aspect of the discussion. The overwhelming majority of speakers stressed that the USSR not only showed initiative in organizing the summit in the Icelandic capital, but also proved by its specific proposals that it sincerely desires peace and is ready to compromise for the sake of achieving accords on the main problem -- the problem of removing the threat of nuclear war.

At the same time, ideas were put forward which seemed to mimic those which official Washington uses in setting out its own "vision" of the results of the Reykjavik meeting.

[Shalnev] Let us go back to the basic theme of the Tokyo conference -- peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region.

[Voss] Speeches by Japanese participants in the conference confirmed that the speech made by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Vladivostok aroused vast interest in the Land of the Rising Sun. Many Japanese delegates spoke with great sympathy and profound satisfaction of the proposals contained in this speech, which were dictated by concern for peace and security in the region. These attitudes were also reflected in the final communique.

The constructive nature of the Delhi declaration recently signed by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi as an important and specific manifestation of a new type of thinking conducive to the search for ways of resolving conflicts in this region was also stressed.

[Shalnev] And how did the discussion of issues relating to bilateral relations go?

[Voss] I would like to remind you that the conference was convened in the year of the 30th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet-Japanese diplomatic relations. The objective situation of our countries is such as to require intensified cooperation on a healthy basis, in a calm atmosphere unburdened by the problems of the past. This has begun. The sides agreed that an important task is to continue political dialogue and to continue talks, primarily on issues on which accord can be reached. There was a lively exchange of opinions on the problems of developing trade and economic ties. The proposals contained in M.S. Gorbachev's Vladivostok speech were supported as opening a new page in this sphere.

[Shalnev] What is your general appraisal?

[Voss] The forum in Tokyo was, of course, an important event. It was constructive and, we hope, productive. [paragraph continues]

The criterion of productivity, in our opinion, is the level of activity by representatives of the two countries' publics in resolving the problems facing both the USSR, Japan, and the world as a whole. What is more, we hope that many of the specific proposals made at the conference -- on the development of bilateral cooperation in such spheres as culture, trade, and education, for example -- will be realized, and that we will be able to sum up the initial results at the next "roundtable" conference, planned for 1988 in the Soviet Union.

TRADE, ECONOMIC CONFERENCE HELD IN JAPAN

LD190716 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The first Soviet-Japanese trade and economic conference has taken place in Japan in the Kansai area.

The conference took place in Osaka, the second most important industrial and cultural center in the country. In March this year, a Soviet-Japanese Trade Federation was created in the Kansai area, which unites eight prefectures in western Japan. The conference participants discussed the state of and prospects for development of Soviet-Japanese trade and economic relations. It was noted with satisfaction that according to the results of the first 9 months of the current year, Japan has once again become one of the three main foreign trade partners of the USSR among the developed capitalist states. Nevertheless, the general opinion was that the volume of cooperation is still far from reaching the two countries' potentials.

In the final document which was adopted, both sides expressed their readiness to exert efforts to establish new forms of cooperation, such as economic coproduction and the setting up of joint enterprises. [video shows Japanese city, conference taking place]

DEPUTY PREMIER KAMENTSEV MEETS DPRK OFFICIAL

PM221411 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 18 December V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Chu Kil-pon, chairman of the DPRK Chemical and Light Industry Committee, who is in Moscow in connection with the conclusion of an intergovernmental agreement on USSR-DPRK cooperation in the production of light industry goods in 1987-1990 and through the year 2000.

An exchange of opinions on questions concerning the further development of Soviet-Korean economic cooperation took place during the conversation, which was held in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

MOSCOW NEWS CONFERENCE HELD ON DRA SITUATION

PM231259 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Dec 86 Second Edition p 5

["Meeting With Foreign Journalists" -- KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] An information meeting between representatives of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, the Association of Soviet Lawyers, and foreign journalists has been held in the press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was devoted to a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

Answering the numerous questions from foreign correspondents, the Soviet participants in the meeting showed the consistent, constructive nature of the course of the Soviet Union and the DRA Government toward the fastest possible achievement of a fair political settlement around Afghanistan, on the basis of an end to, and guaranteed non-resumption of, interference in the internal affairs of the Republic. It was emphasized that the achievement of a political settlement would accelerate the withdrawal of Soviet armed subunits from Afghanistan.

An important practical step of goodwill has been taken by the Soviet side: the withdrawal of six regiments from the limited contingent of the Soviet Armed Forces in Afghanistan. Unfortunately, for the time being there have been no positive actions in response to this step by the Soviet Union and the DRA. The scale of interference in the internal affairs of the sovereign republic is increasing all the time -- the volume of financial, military, and other assistance to the Afghan counterrevolution is growing.

It was emphasized at the meeting that it is incumbent upon all sides concerned with the problem of settling the situation around Afghanistan to respond to the Soviet Union's constructive step.

More on News Conference

LD191949 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 19 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS -- A news conference on matters of political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan was held today at the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry at the request of foreign correspondents. High officials of the USSR Foreign Ministry and of the USSR Defence Ministry took part in it.

"The time has come when the problem of political settlement around Afghanistan requires undelayed solution," said high official of the USSR Foreign Ministry Nikolay Kinayev. "Afghanistan's stand is constructive and realistic. It is now up to Pakistan and the USA. The sooner they show a realistic approach, the sooner the armed aggression against an independent non-aligned state, Afghanistan, is stopped, the sooner Soviet forces will be withdrawn from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Such is our principled stand."

The process settlement of the situation around Afghanistan requires mutual effort and obligations. The Soviet Union declared more than once that it is striving for an early withdrawal of its troops. But this withdrawal can be effected only on conditions that an armed intervention against Afghanistan is stopped, that firm international guarantees of its non-resumption in future are given.

It was pointed out at the meeting that as soon as some progress toward the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan is started, certain Western circles exert efforts to bring to nought the progress that has started and, in the final analysis, to frustrate the process of settlement.

Spokesman for the USSR Defence Ministry Lieutenant-General Mikhail Sostsov pointed out in this connection that the Soviet Union had recalled from Afghanistan six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet forces. This was a major political step, a signal toward an early political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. But after that step of goodwill, the United States considerably stepped up aid to Afghan counter-revolutionaries, thus obstructing achievement of arrangements.

Vice-President of the Association of Soviet Lawyers Igor Blishchenko called the attention to the criminal nature of Afghan counter-revolutionaries' actions. Their bands make raids on civilian facilites, destroy schools, hospitals, mosques, capture hostages. He stressed that both counter-revolutionaries and those states that are accomplices in these crimes bear the responsibility under international law, specifically on the strength of such documents as the sentence passed at the Nuremberg trial and the 1949 Geneva Conventions on the protection of population in wartime and the 1977 protocols supplementing them.

It was emphasised at the meeting that constructive steps toward an early political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan by the other side are required.

AIR DEFENSE CHIEF KOLDUNOV COMPLETES INDIA VISIT

PM230917 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Dec 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] Delhi, 20 Dec -- The official visit to India by Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, has reached its conclusion. He has been here at the invitation of chief Marshal of Aviation L. Lafontaine, chief of staff of the Indian Air Force. During his visit Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov was received by Arjun Singh, Indian minister of state for defense, had a meeting with Admiral (R.Kh. Takhiliani), chairman of the committee of chiefs of staff of the Armed Forces, and other Indian military commanders, and visited a number of the republic's armed forces installations. Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov left for home today.

Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who has been in the Republic of India on an official visit, returned to Moscow on 20 December.

Chief Marshal of Aviation A.I. Koldunov was met at the airport by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister, and other generals and officers.

Those present at the airport included (Ch.V. Ranganatkhan), minister plenipotentiary at the Indian Embassy in Moscow.

MORE ON DOBRYNIN TALK WITH BANGLADESH CP LEADER

OM221615 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "High Appraisal"]

[Text] On 19 December a meeting was held between A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and M. Farhad, secretary general of the Bangladesh Communist Party Central Committee.

In a comradely conversation; M. Farhad spoke about the activities of the Bangladesh Communist Party in the new political situation in Bangladesh, after the recent lifting of martial law and the reinstatement of the republic's constitution and about the Bangladesh Communists' preparations for their party's fourth congress.

A.F. Dobrynin dwelt in detail on the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet people in implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. He explained the essence of the Soviet peace initiatives aimed, among other things, at strengthening peace and security in Asia-Pacific region and gave an assessment of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik and subsequent events in the world arena.

The guest was briefed on the main results of the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's friendly visit to India.

M. Farhad expressed a high opinion of the Soviet Union's consistent policy in the struggle against imperialism and the forces of international reaction and for eliminating the threat of nuclear war and preserving peace on earth.

The sides said they were in favor of the further development and consolidation of the fraternal ties between the CPSU and the Bangladesh Communist Party and the friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and Bangladesh peoples.

SOKOLOV GREETS SRV MINISTER ON ARMY ANNIVERSARY

PM221555 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Dec 86 Second Edition p 1

[Message from Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov to Army General Van Tien Dung, SRV national defense minister]

[Text] To Comrade Army General Van Tien Dung, minister of national defense of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own behalf, I send you and all Vietnamese servicemen combat greetings and cordial congratulations on the 42d anniversary of the Vietnamese People's Army.

Born in the years of struggle against the colonizers, the Army, together with its people, has traveled a long and heroic path, won a difficult struggle, defended the freedom and independence of Vietnam, and now reliably defends the country against aggressive encroachments from outside.

I wish you and all Vietnamese People's Army personnel success in resolving the tasks set by the Sixth Communist Party of Vietnam Congress to further improve your homeland's defense capability and ensure its successful progress along the path of buildng socialism.

May the inviolable friendship and all-around cooperation between our fraternal peoples and armies strengthen and develop.

With communist greetings.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Sokolov, USSR defense minister

VANUATU APPROVES DRAFT FISHING AGREEMENT

LD192307 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 19 Dec 86

[Text] Canberra December 19 TASS -- The Government of Vanuatu approved a draft agreement on fishing with the USSR, the prime minister of Vanuatu Walter Lini reported today.

A statement for the press published by the prime minister's office rebuts interference by the United States and Australia in the affairs of Vanuatu. They try to force that country into abandoning cooperation with the USSR. The Government of Vanuatu opposes all forms of interference on the part of any government in the country's internal affairs, the statement points out. Lini indicated that if it was not easy to scare him with a "Soviet threat".

The newspaper "FIJI SUN" described as "hypocritical" the attempts by such countries as Australia to set Vanuatu against cooperation with the USSR. Those countries should realize, says the editorial article, that island states in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean are capable of making their own decisions.

LAOS COOPERATION COMMISSION MEETING ENDS

LD211328 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 21 Dec 86

[Text] In Vientiane, the eighth session of the intergovernmental commission on economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union and Laos has come to an end. The results of cooperation over the past year were summarized at it, and measures were mapped out to enhance its efficiency. Our correspondent in Laos, Vladislav Gaydamovich reports:

[Gaydamovich] The economic and technical assistanct to Laos will continue to be directed primarily toward developing such key industries as agriculture and forestry, exploiting natural resources, transportation and communications, and on the training of national specialists. The sides stressed that Soviet-Laotian cooperation should continue to go along the road of further improving economic relations on a long-term and mutually beneficial basis. It was noted that the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kaysone Phomvihan, general secretary of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, which took place on 15 October in Moscow, had great significance for the all-round further development of links between our countries.

The members of the Soviet delegation acquainted themselves with the work of one of the leading industrial enterprises in the republic, The No 1 State Construction Organization, paid visits to the construction sites of a technical college, a hospital in Vientiane, and other major installations of Soviet-Laotian cooperation.

PHILIPPINES PRESIDENT SIGNS MASS MEDIA DECREE

LD192143 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 19 Dec 86

[Text] Manila December 19 TASS -- President Corazon Aquino of the Republic of the Philippines has signed a decree on the centralization and regulation of the country's state-run mass media.

The measures set out in the decree envisage broadening the functions and powers of the press service of the Presidential Palace, and directly subordinating the National and Foreign Information Bureau, the Philippines News Agency, and the government-controlled TV and radio stations to it.

Teodoro Benigno, press secretary of the president, has said that the decree is aimed at combatting disinformation which is being spread in the Philippines by some circles and which distorts the policy being pursued by the government.

HUNGARIAN PREMIER LAZAR BEGINS 'WORKING VISIT'

Greeted by Ryzhkov, Antonov

LD221601 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS -- Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic Gyorgy Lazar today arrived in Moscow for a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the Vnukovo Airport he was met by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Aleksey Antonov, other officials.

The airport was decked out with state flags of the Hungarian People's Republic and the Soviet Union.

Presents Award to Sokolov

LD221921 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS -- On behalf of the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic Gyorgy Lazar, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and chairman of Hungary's Council of Ministers, awarded today the order of the Banner of the Hungarian People's Republic with rubies to Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov, alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defence, at the Hungarian Embassy in Moscow. He was awarded the order for his great service in deepening friendship between the Soviet and Hungarian peoples and strengthening cooperation between the Armed Forces of the USSR and Hungary in the campaign for peace and socialism.

Ryzhkov, Lazar Open Talks

LD230902 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 23 Dec 86

[Text] The Hungarian prime minister, Gyorgy Lazar, who arrived in Moscow on Monday for a working visit, has begun talks with his Soviet counterpart Nikolay Ryzhkov. Under discussion is a wide range of issues, first of all the further development of relations between the two socialist nations.

Earlier Gyorgy Lazar emphasized in a press interview that Hungary attached particular importance to its planned and mutually beneficial economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union. This cooperation guarantees the supplies of energy and raw materials for his country and makes it possible to develop its industries in every way possible.

FURTHER COVERAGE OF SOLOMENTSEV VISIT TO ALMA-ATA

Addresses Komsomol Meeting

LD221816 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Dec 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Solomentsev, who is in Alma-Ata, and Comrade Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, had a meeting today with the Komsomol aktiv at the republic's Komsomol Central Committee.

Detachments of working and student youth are working at many key construction projects scheduled for commissioning. Komsomol combine operators have collected over 5 million metric tons of grain for the country this year alone. They have built thousands of houses, nurseries and schools in the 1st year of the 5-year plan on the republic's sovkhozes and kolkhozes. Serik Abdrakhmanov, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Komsomol Central Committee related all of this at the meeting today with Mikhail Sergeyevich Solomentsev.

He noted, however, that there are also serious errors in the work of the Komsomol organizations. The Komsomol committees have become detached from the masses and are only weakly involved in the internationalist education of young people and students. It was said at the meeting that a bureaucratic style of work and formalism in the slection of Komsomol cadres have led to the neglect of educational work among students and in collectives of working youth, and that there have also been major omissions in work with creative youth. This style was subjected to sharp but justified criticism, from which the most serious conclusions were to be drawn. The party's chief assistant, the Komsomol, should in all matters be not a formal but a truly energetic leader among working and student youth, Mikhail Sergeyevich Solomentsev said. [video shows exterior of Komsomol building, then interior shot of meeting in progress, with Solomentsev and Kolbin among those present]

[Begin Solomentsev recording; video shows Solomentsev addressing meeting] We have to spend more time at the center of young peoples' activities. To close down the committee some day, and then to go off to the work place is also, I would say, the kind of work that is done in fits and starts, and is not a system. All right, some people may do things like that, but it is important that every Komsomol activist should be obliged systematically to visit the youth in the countryside, especially where there is a concentration of young people. They simply have to set aside time for this. There has to be a system. Your life should be spent at the center of young peoples' activities. Be the party's closest assistants, its closest assistants. The party has always counted and relied on young people, and is counting on them now, too. [end recording]

Holds Talks With Kolbin

LD221600 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1509 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] A conversation between Mikhail Sergeyevich Solomentsev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee, Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, and the Alma-Ata Komsomol aktiv took place in the Kazakhstan Komsomol Central Committee today.

They discussed the specific participation of members of the Komsomol in implementing the decisions of the 27th congress of the party, restructuring the style and work methods of Komsomol organizations, and the enhancement of their role in the communist upbinging of young people and the development of their initiative and independent actions [initsiativy i samodeyatelnosti].

In the course of the conversation it was stressed that the energy and enthusiasm of the youth could be channeled into honest and fruitful labor and full development of everybody's potential in the interests of the restructuring and acceleration. One cannot tolerate shortcomings in the activity of the Komsomol organizations as far as professional and ideological and moral education is concerned. One has to resolutely eliminate from one's practical activity any formalistic approach, paper shuffling, or superficial and light-minded approach to solving problems. It is necessary to conduct all the work entirely in labor collectives and educational establishments directly, to find forms of real [zhivogo] communication, and to enhance political and public activity of young men and women.

Comrade Razumov, first deputy head of the Organizational Party Work Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Comrade Mendybayev, first secretary of the Alma-Ata Oblast party Committee, took part in the meeting together with Comrades Solomentsev and Kolbin.

OFFICIAL ON EXTENT OF ALMA-ATA RIOTS

PM221424 Paris LE MONDE in French 21-22 Dec 86 p 4

["D.Dh." dispatch: "Several People Killed in Alma-Ata Riots"]

[Text] Moscow -- a Soviet official revealed to a Western diplomat on Friday, 19 December, that several people were killed and many injured in the Alma-Ata riots. The nationalist students who took to the streets of the Kazakhstan capital on Wednesday morning (and not in the evening as TASS reported) numbered several thousand, he explained. Many people were arrested. According to him, the agitation was continuing Friday, but on a limited scale; only a few groups were still demonstrating.

This official also said that the demonstrators were all young Kazakhs brandishing banners written in their language protesting the appointment of Mr Kolbin, a Russian, to replace a Kazakh as leader of their republic.

The television news on the evening of 19 December showed Mr Kolbin visiting a factory in Alma-Ata accompanied by Mr Solomentsev, a Politburo member from Moscow; this visit apparently took place on 18 December.

The riots themselves were not mentioned on this occasion, despite the fact that they were the subject of a television report on the evening of 18 December that was without precedent in the Soviet Union. Only the militia and the "volunteer militia" (druzhina) and not the army were used to suppress the riot.

TRUD NOTES CRITICISMS AT KAZAKH ECONOMIC AKTIV

PM221253 Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 Dec 86 p 2

[TASS report: "Special Attention to State Acceptance"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 19 Dec -- During the 5-year plan all Kazakh SSR industry must go over to manufacturing only high-quality output. This was noted at a republic meeting of the party and economic aktiv held today in Kazakhstan's capital. The tasks of the republic's party, soviet, and economic organs in radically improving the quality of goods and introducing state acceptance of output at associations and industrial enterprises were discussed.

At present, the speakers stressed only 109 industrial enterprises produce goods with the state Seal of Quality. Many plants and factories allowing themselves to fall short of state standards and technical conditions, so that gradings are reduced. Unmarketable goods worth hundreds of millions of rubles have piled up.

State acceptance is intended to raise output quality in the shortest possible time. Its preparation requires from every party committee and labor collective thorough, comprehensive analysis, the elaboration of precise measures, and the timely solution of problems which arise. However, as the facts show, the majority of leaders and party organizations have approached this matter of great state importance in a stereotyped fashion, with old methods, and without proper responsibility.

Revealing the aforementioned and other shortcomings and omissions, the meeting participants pointed to concrete ways of eliminating them. In particular, it was especially said that the switch to state acceptance must be most closely linked with the ideological and organizational activity of party organizations and with greater exactingness toward cadres.

DOLGIKH, SHCHERBINA ATTEND POWER WORKERS MEETING

LD222241 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] Workers in one of the key sectors of the national economy, power engineering, are marking their professional holiday. The labor rhythm of the whole of the country's economy depends to a significant degree on them. A ceremonial meeting devoted to Power Workers Day took place in Moscow today. On the presidium were: Dolgikh, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Shcherbina, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee; directors of a number of ministries; exemplary workers from the power engineering sector; scientists; and representatives of the capital's public. A report was delivered by Mayorets, USSR minister of power and electrification. The workers of this sector have given an assurance that they will apply all of their experience and knowledge for successful completion of the production program for this year ending and a good working start to the new year.

YELTSIN INTERVIEWED AT MOSCOW KOMSOMOL MEETING

LD180002 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1630 GMT on 17 December carries a 30-minute video report entitled "Frank Discussion," in which Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chief of Moscow Gorkom, takes part; an unidentified correspondent presents the program.

As the video shows the meeting in progress, a Komsomol member says: "The Komsomol has very many rights which are enshrined both in the constitution and in the law, in the main legal provisions of the Soviet state. But we are definitely not using these rights. We have forgotten them. The administration has become used to the Komsomol demanding nothing of it. And the administration simply really does not want to share with us its rights because they have forgotten that we have them." A female Komsomol member adds: "The majority of young people here at ZIL [I.A. Likhachev Moscow Automobile Plant] are inactive, passive," and goes on to say that were the Komsomol secretary to enter the workshop or go near the assembly conveyer, these passive youths would not recognize him. The Komsomol bureau never visits the workshops, and if they do it is rarely, together with guests. You don't even know how people are working in the foundry shops. Look in what conditions the foundry workers are working. The shop is 50 years old. You understand, the equipment is worn out. And here, in this question, Boris Nikolayevich, I ask you, you visited us when the delegation came around, you saw the conditions in which the foundry workers are working. I ask you simply to assist in getting our labor alleviated, and then young people will come and join us." [applause]

[Correspondent] "How is restructuring proceeding in the Komsomol and what is standing in its way?"

[Yeltsin] "If you glance through the MOSKOVSKIY AVTOZAVODETS issue of say, 26 November, then apparently everything is sort of going splendidly. For each item, all is well, restructuring is proceeding all the time. If one looks at things, say, on the basis of a fairly interesting article in the 25 November issue of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA -- you've probably read it -- then there is already some doubt creeping in.

"If you judge from say, my meeting in the hostels yesterday -- it lasted 3 hours -- I was going around the hostels and meeting with the boys, and they don't see and don't understand the difference in general between the period in which the congress took place and the present day. In their view: zero, no movement at all! Perhaps there is some initiative among the workers. But to get any further, there is such a stratum there, so to speak: the foreman, the head of the shop, and so forth. Forget the whole thing! Virtually no account is taken either of the Komsomol, of young people, or of its initiative. And there is no real support.

"Judging from today's start of the conference -- well, there was a conventional report plus a greater share of criticism. But, nevertheless a standard one. But if one judges from the start of the speeches, it is already interesting. I believe that the Komsomol has become so overgrown by bureaucratic moss, a cobweb, trite phrases, instructions, paper, and so forth. Can you imagine how many initiatives there were at ZIL alone? They announced so many shock-work weeks that there aren't more in the year as a whole anywhere else. Or, say, in the city, that is to say altogether -- yesterday we tried to count but we lost count: We counted 1,000 initiatives, for the Komsomol only. That is where the real, genuine red tape is, in Komsomol work. The boys are waiting for real work. The boys are waiting for independence. They want to be believed. They want to be given a good, great cause, a major, substantial cause.

"In production they will then contribute their word and deed, and [word indistinct] in everyday life, and they will establish orders in the hostels. They sit night after night in the hostels doing nothing. They don't do gymnastics, they don't go in for sports. But, on the other hand, they need to fill in the sociopolitical passport. Such paper. But nobody understands anything. An initiative prior to the 47th conference. Again some 46 shock-work shifts have to be worked. Again: yesterday shock-work and after the conference, on Monday, already it was good-bye to everything. The shock-work ends, ordinary work starts. And this initiative, (?virtually) empty, which is not based on anything, also does not make the boys enthusiastic. It does not excite them, you understand, it does not appeal to them. It is not seeking, to arouse in him the desire, tell him simply to rush into the breach, to work properly.

"What is the Komsomol short of today? There are not enough revolutioanry actions. At present there is a situation in our country where the plans and decisions themselves, so to speak, of the congress require revolutionary actions. It is a matter of revolutionary transformations, a matter of the renewal of society. There are no revolutionary actions in the Komsomol, none in the city and none in ZIL."

[Reporter] "The young people, the Komsomol, in my view are currently experiencing an acute lack of confidence."

[Yeltsin] "Well, it was written 6,000 years ago in cuneiform, you know, that our young people are bad, they do not respect their elders, there is no honoring of rank, so to speak, there are no authorities. Socrates said the very same thing, and all through these 6,000 years and to this day we're still saying that our young people are not what we were. Those were young people at that time. So from generation to generation everything goes on just the same, so that young people today are obligatorily worse, supposedly, than they were yesterday. I don't think so. Nevertheless, it is we who are, probably to a greater degree, if not primarily, guilty. It is we who have driven the Komsomol into a bureaucratic impasse, it is we who drove them into instructions and paperwork, it is we who created this situation. Following the congress we now have a real opportunity of revolutionizing this process, from the point of view of the party leadership of the Komsomol, too. And the most important thing is to give them the opportunity of revealing themselves, to let them be creative and independent, not to drive them.

"Who's driving whom, you ask? 'You Menshevik', the secretary of the party committee says, 'we'll deal with you in a minute' -- that's the point. Everything in that sentence comes from the point of view of the party leadership of the Komsomol, the whole style. If we don't break this, our party style -- and this is the work of the town party committee in the given instance, and the raykom, and the party committee of let's say, ZIL -- then they are not going to get on their feet by themselves, so to speak. We're stifling them too much with all this, we're stifling them, quite simply, you understand, from start to finish with formal instructions."

[Reporter] "Boris Nikolayevich, much is now being said about informal associations of young people and informal leaders. What is your view?"

[Yeltsin] "All in all, we have taken upon ourselves in this process too much of a prohibitory function. You understand, it is not just a function, but a tactic and a policy that are prohibitory. They are banned from dancing in a certain way -- they've gone underground. A kind of music is banned -- they've gone off to apartments where they're out of sight.

"Some kind of association is banned -- they've crept off, so to speak, somewhere where people dance on their heads but not in full view, where you would have to show class and you really have to be able to dance well. So really, on the contrary, you have to get the kids out of there and give them the opportunity to show what they can do, allow them to start up informal associations; but, of course, not on the basis of a lack of ideological outlook, but from an ideological and educational viewpoint, in accordance with the decisions of the congress, and yet to find creative freedom, an unfettering, their own opinion and principles."

[Reporter] "We frequently come up against cases of Komsomol workers being afraid of making television appearances, and this applies to quite different sections of the Komsomol. And throughout the entire period that 'World and Youth' has been aired, the platform afforded by Central Television has only been used twice, probably."

[Yeltsin] "Well it is to be regretted, it is to be regretted that a situation has come about in which people are afraid; they seem to think that if you haven't cleared the few words you are going to say with a higher organization then you can't have your say. But the atmosphere has changed now. I was told yesterday -- this is why I made the proposal today -- I was told yesterday how the speakers were prepared. I hope Nikolay [Yeltsin points to young man nearby] won't be offended when I describe it: The secretary of the party committee of the factory arrives; he sits the girl down next to him and says, let's do some work on your speech. And what is the upshot: How many of her ideas, the ideas of the Komsomol girl, remain in the speech, and how many of the party committee secretary's? Well, probably 99 percent belong to the secretary of the party committee, and just a word or two -- hello and good-bye -- belong to her.

"The suggestion is this, therefore: Let the young people speak up boldly, frankly and openly, and indeed say in real terms how the Komsomol organization has been restructured, what has been done by it this year, what has been done during the period under review, and how its work can be assessed in general. But then again, not according to yesterday's criteria, but according to the criteria of today. This is what is important."

[Reporter] "The '12th floor' program intends now to tell about the Muscovite youth movement for the preservation of the historic monuments and architecture of the capital. Do you know anything about this movement?"

[Yeltsin] "I know that this movement is starting and I would very much welcome it. Everyone should be involved in Moscow affairs. We cannot manage here without youth. We must exclusively use the efforts of all people to restore the center of Moscow. A decision about it has now been taken and the concept of the development of Moscow until the year 2000 was discussed at the Politburo and the decision on the center of Moscow has been made by the gorkom bureau and the gorispolkom. And the Komsomol can help a great deal by participating in the restoration.

"The Volga Auto workers needed 4 days, whereas Moscow demands 6 days. So many problems have accumulated: social and other problems, problems to do with improvement. We must tidy things up in Moscow with our own hands, with the assistance of Muscovites, with the hands of Muscovites. Perhaps we need 6, or all right, just 4 days. How many days, in fact, did the ZIL Komsomol member take? Only 1 day this year. Such is the discrepancy between words and deeds. This is his report and this is in reality the state of affairs. The most terrible thing is this apathy.

"We must now stir things up, so that every one becomes concerned, absolutely everyone is concerned and committed and cares about the cause, about his works, the workshop he works in, Moscow and the affairs of the country."

[Reporters] "Search, Creativity and Inititative: These are the main points of the works conference. More delgates spoke than usual. How boldly and openly they spoke; how many concrete suggestions and additons they introduced into the draft decision. There were no apathetic people here. By the way, Aleksandr Malakhov, the new secretary of the Komsomol committee, was elected in an open ballot. One can believe that it is impossible to work badly after such a discussion."

SAKHAROV, BONNER RETURN TO MOSCOW 23 DEC

HK230512 Hong Kong AFP in English 0456 GMT 23 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow, Dec 23 (AFP) -- Dissident nuclear physicist Andrey Sakharov returned to Moscow Tuesday morning after seven years of internal exile in Gorkiy, an industrial city closed to foreigners, 400 kms (250 miles) east of here.

Mr. Sakharov, a Nobel Peace Prize-winner known as the "father of the Soviet H-bomb", stepped of a train at Moscow's Yaroslav Station shortly after 7 a.m., accompanied by his wife Yelena Bonner, who in 1984 was sentenced to five years' internal exile -- although she was allowed to go to the United States for heart surgery.

The leading dissident was last week personally authorized by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to return to the capital, apparently unconditionally.

It is not clear whether he will resume his work at the Soviet Academy of Science.

He said Sunday that he would continue to fight for human rights in the Soviet Union and would demand the release of Jewish "refuseniks" who are denied permission to leave the country to rejoin their families.

After spending 40 minutes fighting his way along the platform through a pack of Western journalists to get to the car where friends were waiting to take him to this apartment, Mr Sakharov broke silence to confirm that he would keep fighting for human rights ad said he would be taking part in seminar at the Academy of Science.

His wife left the train and got to the car before him because, he said, she was ill and could not stand up for nay length of time.

Sakharov Discusses Return

AU230950 Paris AFP in English 0956 GMT 23 Dec 86

[Sylvie Kauffmann report]

[Excerpts] Dec 23 (AFP) -- Dissident nuclear physicist Andrey Sakharov arrived in Moscow early Tuesday accompanied by his wife Yelena Bonner after seven years of internal exile and pledged to continue fighting for liberty and human rights "with all my energy."

Visibly tired, 65-year-old Mr. Sakharov told the crowd of waiting journalists at the station that he felt a mixture of "happiness, emotion and worry," and added:

"The fate of my friends in prisons and camps is tragic. I will write and speak out so long as I have energy. I'm worried about their fate. I hope that my release will contribute to solving the problem of prisoners of conscience."

"I hope I'll be totally free," said the Nobel Peace Prize-winner known as "father" of the Soviet atomic bomb, adding that "there will be plenty of difficulties because liberty is a responsibility."

The leading dissident was last Tuesday personally authorized by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to return to the capital, apparently unconditionally.

Mr. Sakharov said in answer to a question that he would be ready to emigrate, but that leaving was "impossible for the time being because of the (secret) work I did." He added that "if circumstances changed, I would be ready to leave."

He said he was unable to "get rid for one moment of the consternation" caused by the death "in martyrdom" of fellow dissident Anatoliy Marchenko "in his struggle against injustice." Mr. Marchenko died in Chistopol prison on December 8 at the age of 48.

"We were not able to save Marchenko," he said, "but we must save the others."

Mr. Sakharov confirmed that he would resume work at the Physics Institute of the Academy of Science here and "start the ordinary life of an ordinary researcher." He said he was very tired and in bad health.

He spoke after spending 40 minutes elbowing his way from the platform of Moscow's Yaroslav railway station through a pack of Western journalists to get to the car waiting to take him to his apartment. [passage omitted]

Mr. Sakharov said his telephone conversation last Tuesday with Mr. Gorbachev had been "unexpected and brief. He told me: 'You can return to Moscow and so can Bonner'. I told him she was my wife."

Mr. Sakharov said he was ready to meet Mr. Gorbachev, but that the meeting did not depend on him. "I don't refuse any meeting."

Mr. Sakharov said the right to move freely, including the right to leave the Soviet Union, had to be obtained, and that he expected that "everything would change" concerning human rights in the Soviet Union.

He said he could not explain why he was released at this time. "It had to happen sooner or later. A lot of attention was concentrated on me. That could not last forever."

Mr. Sakharov thanked the statesmen, colleagues, his children and his wife who fought for him during his seven-year exile.

He said the Afghan question was "the most painful aspect of our foreign policy" and called for "a decisive action" to end the conflict.

Mr. Sakharov said that "isolation was the worst" aspect of his exile in Gorkiy. "I survived thanks to my wife. She cured me after my forced hospitalization. She is not well herself, she has a bad heart and bad legs, she can't walk."

When they arrived at their apartment, Mrs. Bonner closed the door and said the couple would meet no one Tuesday. "I don't want him to be ill here," she said.

SUPREME SOVIET DELEGATION RETURNS FROM U.S.

LD202026 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 20 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 20 TASS -- Parliamentarians can do a good deal to create an atmosphere of confidence and mutual understanding among nations, Viktor Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the newspaper "PRAVDA", told TASS. He headed the group of deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet which wound up to its trip to the United States and Canada today. The delegation also involved deputies Irina Blokhina and Kirill Lavrov.

In departing to the United States, we set ourselves the goal to keep the dialogue on the parliamentary level going, to get to know better each other's positions on a number of urgent foreign policy and domestic problems, and exchange information, the head of the delegation said. I hold that this goal has been achieved.

Interest in the United States in our country, in the changes under way in it is immense. In their turn, the Soviet people are eager to know how Americans live. Television debates between Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians can meet this interest to some extent. One of our discussions with U.S. congressmen focused precisely on holding such meetings of representatives of the two countries' legislative bodies via communications satellites.

We agreed to hold several telecommunications session under the general motto "New Mentality in the Space Age". The first broadcast scheduled for next March will be called "Let Us Get Acquainted". It will tell television viewers in the general form about who we are, what problems we have, about our customs, the essence of our political system and constitution.

It is planned to discuss in the future such issues as ecology and human rights, the problems of international security and regional conflicts. In short, everything which our people show interest in. We in the USSR attach great significance to this new form of parliamentary ties, which I am sure will help us to understand each other better, Afanasyev said.

The trip to Canada was also very interesting. The meetings, receptions and talks were candid and open. They confirmed that the two countries hold identical stands on major issues of our time, reflected the mutual aspiration to develop our friendly relations, forge contacts among MPS. This was demonstrated by the discussion of the issue of setting up a Soviet-Canadian section in the USSR parliamentary group and a Canadian-Soviet association on ties with the USSR Supreme Soviet in Canada's Parliament.

'ADMIRAL NAKHIMOV' INQUIRY SHOWS SAFETY BREACHES

LD171433 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 17 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS -- Breaches of navigational safety regulations by both skippers were established by the investigation, now closed, of the circumstances of the sinking of the Admiral Nakhimov passenger ship, which collided with the Petr Vasev dry cargo carrier on the night of August 31.

The last documents have been filed into the 60 volumes of the investigation, the newspaper MOSCOW NEWS reports today.

Commenting on the circumstances of the sinking of the Admiral Nakhimov, Boris Uvarov, senior investigator for special cases of the Procurator's Office of the Russian Federation said that the course and reverse records of the Petr Vasev had made it possible to reproduce the commands given from the bridge of the dry cargo carrier just before the disaster.

At the start of the investigation, he continued, it seemed that the navigators of the passenger ship had been the victims, all the more so since one of them, Second Mate Chudnovskiy, who had been on duty, had perished. Yet an expert study done by navigators and naval specialists established that both skippers had breached safety regulations.

Naturally, it is the court that will apportion the guilt. Yet the very fact that, in addition to other breaches, Admiral Nakhimov skipper Markov, having climbed the bridge, failed to give the alarm -- and he only needed to push a button -- is hardly excusable. The crew proved absolutely unmanageable as a result and the passengers were caught unawares.

Authorities agree, the investigator concluded, that no contemporary ship could have stood up to such a blow. As for the Admiral Nakhimov, its body was remarkably strong. Over decades of operation, the thickness of its sides, made from top-grade steel and copper, had decreased by a mere 1.5 mm. The design, however, was far from perfect. The admiral Nakhimov had only one compartment and was easy to sink. Moreover, it was virtually the largest passenger vessel, capable of accommodating 1,100.

Bravery Awards for Rescuers

PM230903 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 December 1986 First Edition carries on page 3 two USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees, signed by Chairman Gromyko and SEcretary Menteshashvili and dated 10 December 1986, conferring bravery awards. The first decree confers on naval personnel five Orders of the Red Star -- two posthumously -- one Ushakov Medal, and one Combat Service Medal; the second decree confers on three members of the KGB the Order of the Red Star.

There is also a 600-word article entitled "The Courage of the Rescuers" by own correspondent Captain 3d Rank V. Pasyakin carried under the decrees. The article describes briefly the operation to rescue the passengers on the "Admiral Nakhimov," shipwrecked 31 August 1986, involving the above award-winners. It stresses the great speed with which naval border troops responded: "Hundreds of people," it says, "owe their lives to the border troops' speed" -- and the courage shown by naval personnel.

FARMS CONCERNED ABOUT FROST DAMAGE TO WINTER CROPS

PM221539 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 2

[O. Pavlov "Agricultural Review": "Beneath Frosty Skies"]

[Excerpts] The 210 million metric tons of grain produced this year will have to be increased by more than 10 percent next year. This is a major task. This is why readers are now ringing the newspaper and asking: How has the recent sharp drop in temperature affected crops? Before it happened we had had quite a mild fall and there were no really heavy snowfalls. This is why people are alarmed. Especially alarmed for the state of winter crops. They are safe as long as they are covered with at least 2 cm of snow.

Specialists with the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee have given us the following statistics. The southernmost edge of the snow cover follows a line through Kishinev, Kirovograd, Poltava, Voronezh, Volgograd, Guryev, and Nukus. It is up to 10 cm deep. Winter crops did not appear to be in any critical condition as of 15 December.

There is a fair amount of snow in the Kirov, Omsk, and Novosibirsk Oblast and Altay Kray regions.

Almost nowhere this year has there been any danger at winter crop tillering node depth. In the last 2 days, however, some danger has arisen in the Moscow region, in some rayons of the Latvian SSR, and in some other areas where the land is exposed.

The temperature has now risen slightly, but this does not mean that everything is all right. Rayon agroindustrial association agrarian services are stepping up their monitoring of the condition of winter crops. Specialists are acting correctly where they are not counting on the favorable weather continuing but are taking samples of winter crops to test their durability. [passage omitted]

The number of economic units in Belorussia that have increased their milk production this year is close to 2,500. The average milk yield per cow has risen 220 kg in 11 months.

According to figures issued on 1 December, livestock and fowl purchases in the RSFSR have increased by 8 percent in comparison with figures for the same time last year, milk purchases have increased by 5 percent, and eggs by 5 percent. Only Pskov and Kaliningrad Oblasts and the Yakut ASSR have milk sales slightly lower than last year. [passage omitted]

CSA REPORT ON MEAT, DAIRY PRODUCTION CITED

LD221857 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 22 Dec 86

[Text] According to a USSR Central Statistical Administration [CSA] report received today, the plan for state procurement of milk and meat has been overfulfilled. All union republics have fulfilled the milk plan except Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Estonia. The greatest amount of produce came in from the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Lithuania. All union republics exceeded last year's level. The meat plan was overfulfilled for the country as a whole, mainly thanks to these same republics, while the farms of Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and some other republics have promised to complete the annual plan at the end of December.

Our commentator notes that the systematic increase in animal product procurement is due to the particular concern of workers in the agroindustrial complex to reinforce the fodder basis. An example of this is set by the party organizations of Belgorod Oblast. They have achieved a restructuring of the system of fodder production. The foundation for this is an increase in high-protein fodder production.

Industrial technology for animal care has been introduced on almost all farms. In Belgorod, they have managed to organize milk procurement, conservation, and processing in excellent fashion. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and other union republics have achieved a significant improvement in milk quality: 81 percent of the country's milk is now being accepted as first class. Not long ago, only a little more than 33 percent was thus accepted. As for meat procurement, the most efficient system which has been applied in Lithuania for more than 20 years, is now being studied. Good roads are being built, weighing facilities [vesovoye khozyaystvo] are being set up, and experts trained.

However, in spite of the all-union livestock successes, in many oblasts and republics there are great contrasts in the work of farms. As our correspondent reports from Uzbekistan, in Kashkadarya Oblast the average daily milk yield from a cow at present is only about 3 kilograms. A goat gives more milk. In the Bukhara Oblast great losses are being tolerated in meat production. It is reported from Sverdlovsk that repairs of livestock accommodation have not been completed in the Krinskiy Rayon, and on Bardymskiy sovkhoz fodder is being kept in the open air.

RSFSR CSA ISSUES AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION DATA

LD201044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Dec 86

[Text] We have just received a report from the RSFSR Central Statistical Administration [CSA]: The republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes have overfulfilled the plans for procurement of milk and meat, with almost 36 million metric tons of milk procured; that is 3 percent above plan and 6 percent more than by the same time last year. Best results were achieved by the farmers in Belgorod, Tambov, Volgograd and Saratov Oblasts as well as in Krasnodar Kray. There have been 9,381,000 metric tons of livestock and poultry procured, which is 753,000 metric tons more than a year ago. Good organization of work among the farmers of Belgorod Oblast should be particularly noted: They have overfulfilled the meat plan by 20 percent. The people from Belgorod have been able to achieve this success thanks to the widespread introduction of collective subcontracting. Among the best for production and procurement of meat are the Penza, Leningrad and Vologda Oblast farms, and also those in Krasnodar Kray. The collective of the Kuban agroindustrial combine have set an example of excellent work: The procurement of products is proceeding rhythmically there, without undue haste. This collective has its own processing enterprises and shops, which makes it possible to market output with minimum losses.

The overall success of the Russian Federation is the result of the strengthening of the fodder base. There are fodder shops in operation almost everywhere, and where there is insufficient fuel for them they go over to preparation of moist fodder mixtures. But there are still quite a lot of unused reserves in the Russian Federation for increasing meat production.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Orenburg and Chita Oblasts and the Chechen-Ingush ASSR are particularly behind. This republic is also behind in milk production.

TASS REPORTS 'MIR' ORBITAL STATION PARAMETERS

LD192024 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 19 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 19 TASS -- TASS correspondent reports from the Flight Control Centre:

The orbital station "Mir" has been operating in near-terrestrial space for nine months. After Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyev accomplished their mission, the station has been flying in an automatic mode. According to telemetry, "Mir"'s onboard systems function normally. The parameters of its orbit are as follows:

Maximum distance from the earth's surface -- 349 kilometres,
Minimum distance from the earth's surface -- 321 kilometres,
Period of revolution -- 91.1 minutes,
Inclination -- 51.6 degrees.

The orbital complex "Salyut-7-Cosmos-1686", shifted to the orbit close to the circular one four months ago, which is currently about 480 kilometres high, continues its flight. The "Salyut-7" station now undergoes serviceability tests stipulated by the programme.

The Control Centre processes the incoming information.

COSMONAUT DESCRIBES JOINT SYRIAN SPACEFLIGHT

LD181651 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Excerpts] A report from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center: Two Syrian pilots selected for a Soviet-Syrian space flight have completed a course of theory at the training center for cosmonauts. From the New Year they will start to train for the expedition as part of the main and stand-by crews. [passage omitted] The director of the flight, Valeriy Viktorovich Ryumin, USSR pilot cosmonaut and twice Hero of the Soviet Union, spoke of the flight program at the news conference.

[Ryumin] The start is currently planned for 22 July at approximately 0630 in the morning [0330 GMT]. [passage omitted]

After moving to the space station, the crew will set about fulfulling a joint program. Research in several fields is envisaged. I should note that the first is research into the earth's natural resources. The experiment is called Al-Furat [Euphrates]. It is to be carried out with the use of IKT-140 photographic equipment for manual cameras, set up on the station. The objective of the research is to carry out research into artificial reservoirs, their silting-up, drainage sytems, water resources, the study of forests and agricultural land.

The next field of research is geophysics and the experiment is called Bosra; that is the study of the ionosphere and determination of the external factors influencing the processes that take place in it; refinement of the model of the ionosphere and elucidation of the influence of the processes that take place in the upper atmosphere on conditions on earth. The apparatus to be use is Missiya -- equipment jointly developed by the USSR and Syria. Similar equipment has been used before, but in this instance it was necessary to work some more on it and fit it to this experiment.

The next field of research is technological experiments. They bear the names Palmira and Kasyun. Palmira is growing crystals from water solutions, obtaining spatial structures that emerge from a multitude of microcrystals and their coming together and interlocking in the condition of microgravitation. Kasyun is also a technological experiment -- the study of the influence of microgravitation on the microstructure of guided-crystallized (?eutectic) alloys, the determination of diffuse parameters in the melt near the front of crystallization.

The next field of research is space medicine -- traditional research which is carried out in the acute period of readaptation. The cardiovascular system will be subjected to study with the apparatus that exists on the station; study of the hemogenic system will be carried out with the use of a minicentrifuge which will be on the station -- that is analysis of blood taken from the operators during the flight. Research will be carried out under the name Anketa, and the study called Kontrast is a study of the frequency-contrast characteristics of the visual system of man. [passage omitted]

Details of News Conference

LD192215 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2043 GMT 18 Dec 86

[Special report on USSR Foreign Ministry press conference held 18 December devoted to USSR-Syria space launch; presented by correspondent A. Galkin after conclusion of "Vremya" newscast -- recorded]

[Text] [Galkin] Two Syrian pilots, candidate cosmonauts, have completed a course of theoretical studies in Zvezdnyy Gorodok. From the new year onward they will begin to prepare for an expedition into orbit as part of the space crews. They were presented at the news conference by Air Force Major General Leonov, deputy head of the Cosmonaut Training Center. [video shows medium shot of those holding the news conference seated on platform behind long desk, shots of journalists taking notes]

[Leonov] The research cosmonauts of the Syrian Arab Republic, Lieutenant Colonel Muhammad Faris and Lieutenant Colonel Munir Habib, arrived at the Cosmonaut Training Center in October 1985. During that same month they started in the general space training program. General space training included the study of fundamental sciences connected with the study of disciplines such as flight dynamics, control systems, the fundamentals of space navigation, practical work on simulators, medico-biological training, physical training, and the study of the Russian language. A total of 1,400 hours was spent in training. From September until December the research cosmonauts studied spacecraft, including the specific system of the "Soyuz-T" spacecraft and the "Mir" orbiting station on which they will have to fly, and studied the systems with which they will have to work.

All in all they have arrived at such a level where a crew can be formed and the direct preparation for the space flight can be started. The decision regarding the makeup of the crews was made yesterday.

The main crew is made up as the follows: the commander, Lt Col Aleksandr Stepanovich Viktorenko; the flight engineer, USSR pilot cosmonaut, Hero of the Soviet Union Aleksandr Pavlovich Aleksandrov; and the research cosmonaut, Lt Col Muhammad Ahmad Faris.

The backup crew is made up as follows: the crew commander, Lt Col Anatoliy Yakovlevich Solovyev; the flight engineer, USSR pilot cosmonaut, twice Hero of the Soviet Union Viktor Petrovich Savinykh; and the research cosmonaut, Lt Col Munir Habib Habib.

The commander of the main crew is Lt Col Aleksandr Stepanovich Viktorenko. He was born in 1947. In 1969 he graduated from the Orenburg Higher Air Force College. He is a first class military pilot and a third class test pilot. He has undergone very long training as a test cosmonaut and was repeatedly the commander of a backup crew under the programs of the "Salyut" and "Mir" orbiting stations.

Flight engineer Aleksandr Pavlovich Aleksandrov, Hero of the Soviet Union, was born in 1943. In 1983 he carried out a 150-day space flight aboard the Soyuz-7/Soyuz-T orbiting complex. Together with Comrade Viktorenko, his commander, Aleksandrov acted as a backup crew for the Kizim-Solovyev crew.

On the whole they are very experienced cosmonauts.

The research cosmonaut of the main crew, Lt Col Muhammad Ahmad Faris, was born in 1951. He is a military pilot and instructor. He arrived at the Cosmonaut Training Center in 1985, and during this period he showed a very high level of knowledge of what he had been taught. [video shows Leonov, other cosmonauts, and audience]

The commander of the second crew, Lt Col Solovyev, was born in 1948. In 1972 he graduated from the Chernigov Higher Air Force College. He is a first-class military pilot and a second-class test pilot. He has been at the Cosmonaut Training Center since 1976.

The flight engineer of the second crew, Viktor Petrovich Savinykh, was born in 1940. He has carried out two space flights.

The research cosmonaut of the second crew, Lt Col Munir Habib Habib, was born in 1953. He is a military pilot instructor.

That's some brief information on the crews.

[Galkin] 'Abdallah al-Zurf, general of a Syrian Air Force division, has stated: We have brought from our country the warmest wishes to the Soviet people and the hope that the Soviet-Syrian crew will successfully fulfill its mission, which we consider to be a bright material expression of the friendship and cooperation which links our countries. He also stressed that usually the candidates of the main crew are designated by the country from which the cosmonauts came, but we value equally highly both Muhammad Faris and Munir Habib; therefore we offered the right of choice to the Soviet side. They have more accurate criteria for appraisal.

Flight director Valeriy Ryumin reported that the launch is planned for the end of next July. The programs of this expedition are rich with various experiments on natural history and geophysical, technological, and medical experiments. Specialists of the Soviet Union and Syria are taking part in the experiments' preparation and also in the elaboration of apparatus.

[Ryumin] We are planning that before the flight of the Syrian crew, an astrophysical module will be docked with the "Mir" station and work will be carried out. This will include a complex of scientific research using apparatus installed on it. This is astrophysics, mainly.

[Galkin] A question was asked: How did the backup crew take the fact that they won't be flying into space? Munir Habib said: I will behave as a member of the backup crew just as if I were working as a member of the main one. Moreover, situations do occur where the backup crew becomes the main one. [video shows Habib speaking]

[Solovyev] Our backup crew will be fully prepared and will be found to be as good as the first crew.

[Galkin] Correspondents inquired as to whether any of the backups of previous international crews would succeed in realizing their dream of space flight.

[Leonov] All backup cosmonauts, representatives of countries who flew on our spaceships, have not broken with space; on the contrary, they have become great specialists, scientists in that area. And at present anyone of those who were backups in the past, in general, in our view, can take up a place in a spaceship according to his level of training. Two representatives of France, Jean-Loup Chretien and Michel Tonini are currently in the Soviet Union undergoing training; they have already started training. At the beginning of January two representatives of Bulgaria will arrive in the Soviet Union. One of the candidates for this place is Aleksandrov, a former research cosmonaut and backup. Of course we would like him to pass the repeat medical competition and to join this group.

[Galkin] The Syrian pilots told the journalists about life and work in Zvezdnyy Gorodok and expressed gratitude to specialists in the Cosmonaut Training Center for their help in coming to grips with a complicated profession. The forthcoming joint work of scientists and specialists and cosmonauts under the flags of the USSR and the Syrian Arab Republic, they stated, will become an important landmark in the peaceful mastering of space. [video shows lineup of those holding the news conference]

PLANS FOR 2D JOINT BULGARIAN SPACE VENTURE NOTED

LD211808 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 21 Dec 86

[Excerpt] Two spacemen-hopefuls are coming from Bulgaria to the Soviet Union in January for a second Soviet-Bulgarian space venture. This was reported by Aleksey Leonov, one of the people in charge of the Soviet space program. The mission is slated for 1988. Both nations' research centers have been working on an extensive program of the mission to be executed on board the Mir orbital station with the stress being on astrophysics and space technology. [passage omitted]